

Evaluation dispute begins to boil

NEA writes; Darnton meets; groups act

Again, in a letter sent yesterday to members of the Board of Regents, the Missouri Southern unit of the NEA is making an attempt to meet with Regents to settle the present evaluation situation.

In similar action, Dr. Donald Darnton, president of the college, has been conducting meetings with faculty in various departments in order to hear their feelings on the present evaluation system.

And when the Missouri Southern Board of Regents meets Dec. 19, Dr. Darnton hopes to present to members a solution to the evaluation problem.

Because of the importance of the evaluation issue, pages 5-9 of this edition of The Chart are devoted entirely to the subject.

Darnton said his meetings with faculty were to "explore ideas and try to come to an understanding of what steps might be taken."

In his letter the NEA lists three topics for discussion: "1. Establishment of the evaluation system; 2. Establishment of a fair salary increase for all faculty; 3. Resolution of other urgent problems and faculty concerns."

"We feel that the Board of Regents and the President are definitely aware of the situation and we felt it was time for us to offer our help again," said Donald Boehning, executive professor of math and president of the local NEA chapter.

But said Darnton, "I don't have a solution that I am ready to propose to the Board of Regents."

"Neither I nor the Board felt there was ever a right evaluation system. But the present system can be changed," said Darnton.

AS FOR student evaluations, Darnton said, "Whether they are direct or indirect is not the key to the relative bearing they have on the faculty member. The weight, which even way it goes given to the student evaluation has a greater bearing."

Boehning said that NEA would be in touch with the board for it was the board that initiated the present policy, although, said Boehning, "The president said he concurred with that decision."

However, Dr. Darnton said that the regents had decided that the matter should be settled on campus, through the board of regents, before any proposal is presented to them.

Boehning noted that NEA negotiations with the administration were carried out through the Faculty Senate and the Welfare Committee.

THE DECISION to send this latest letter, said Boehning, was made in a Tuesday night meeting of the NEA Crisis Committee of which he is the chairman.

He said that the committee is made up of 21 members. The committee consists of nine building representatives, nine alternate building representatives, and the NEA's three executive officers.

"There is a need for building representatives because," said Boehning, "Not every need is the same in all the buildings."

"We've got to represent the entire faculty if we are to be effective," said Boehning.

THE CRISIS COMMITTEE meets at each point where the NEA feels that next step is necessary. Boehning said that the committee has a list of opinions open to them, but that, he hope there would be no further protest needed.

At this time Boehning said that he could not give an accurate count on the

number of NEA members because the numbers were changing every day. However, he did say that a majority of the faculty were NEA members.

Also, said Boehning, "There was a number of faculty members supporting us and helping us although they are not members."

HOWEVER, Boehning would not release the names of the other NEA officers. He said that he thought there would be nothing wrong with his doing so, yet he felt that he should gain their approval before doing so.

Said Boehning, "As long as they take shots at me that is O.K. At some point where NEA has come in people have lost their jobs, although I don't anticipate that happening here."

In their annual protest, the NEA distributed handbills to students and the general public. Also, copies were sent to student organization presidents. Although too early for response Boehning said that he has received supportive feedback.

However, before press time The Chart had been contacted by two student organizations, CIRUNA and Student Na-

tional Educators Association, about their various activities in this matter.

BOEHNING SAID that he thought it was good for the NEA to take the evaluation situation outside the college community. "We don't live in an ivory tower, although we may like it to think so. We're human, we have our problems. I think it gives us a realistic image."

Besides student evaluations, the NEA is also disgruntled with the system of merit pay allotments.

"We are calling for a moratorium on merit pay if there is less than a cost of living raise for all faculty," said Boehning.

IN THE VIEWPOINT of NEA, if there is a less than cost of living raise for all faculty and a faculty member with a 90 on evaluations and one with an 80, the faculty member with the 90 will receive merit pay. In the eyes of the NEA, "This is punishing a faculty member for a five point difference," said Boehning.

As far as student concern over the evaluation, Darnton said, "I think the students concern is in the quality of the

Continued on page 2

No Senate quorum for resolution debate

While news from area television stations waited, Student Government began gathering last night for its regularly scheduled meeting. The principal topic of discussion was to be a resolution of support for the local chapter of National Education Association.

But the Southern-Drury basketball game in Springfield apparently drew more interest, and with only 17 members present, four short of a quorum, debate on the resolution had to be postponed until the Senate's first meeting of the spring semester, scheduled for Jan. 21.

Instead, the Senators present addressed Christmas cards to faculty members.

The resolution will be debated in now in its third draft from the Senate's judicial committee and presently reads as follows:

"Whereas Missouri Southern State College's Student Senate is the legitimate representative of Missouri Southern's student community and has a right as well as responsibility to voice the concerns of students and reasonable requests in disputes affecting students:

"AWARE THAT a controversy has arisen over faculty evaluations by students with specific reference to the current system's effect upon faculty salary;

"Noting that the student community has been given an administrative task for which we must admit we are not qualified;

"Pointing out that most students do not wish the burden of determining faculty pay scale, especially in these high inflationary times;

"Explaining that some students who happen to be consistently poor achievers will unduly influence their teachers no matter the skill and performance;

"KNOWING THAT some students use evaluations as a means of venting frustrations and make the evaluations a written vendetta and an unconstructive attack on faculty;

"Realizing that some students tend to overrate faculty by maintaining it will somehow help their grades;

"Believing that the evaluation in use is ambiguously worded, does not project the true feelings of students, and is without proven capability;

"Contending that the present evaluation form, the SIR, is a better statistical instrument of evaluation than the current system;

"CONCERNED THAT resolution to this problem will come about when disputing parties meet and openly discuss the issue, which it has not been done;

"Acknowledging that Missouri Southern's Board of Regents is the body that maintains the present evaluation system;

"Also acknowledging that Missouri Southern's unit of the National Education Association is the moving force behind efforts to change the evaluation policy and is the legitimate representative of faculty on this issue;

"Hoping that both Missouri Southern's Board of Regents and MSSC-NEA will consider student welfare on this issue and include students in discussion;

"STATING THAT the student community does believe in the spirit of faculty evaluation for improvement and should be allowed a forum to present healthy criticism; and therefore, we

"1. Oppose any faculty evaluation by students which becomes a factor in decision of faculty salary;

"2. Ask Missouri Southern's Board of Regents to discontinue the current system and approve an equitable faculty evaluation that students to comment for instruction improvement;

"3. REQUEST Missouri Southern's Board of Regents to meet with MSSC-NEA representatives so that the dispute can be resolved without delay;

"4. Recommend that if the current evaluation system is continued then it be extended to faculty and allow them to evaluate their respective department heads and administrators with the same effects; and

"5. Suggest that all other campus organizations and individual students voice their disapproval of the current evaluation process by phoning or writing Board of Regents members and attending Regents meetings."

about," said James Philliber, president of MSSEA.

"We're trying to decide on what kind of stand to take. But we don't have enough information to know what's going on," he said.

"We had heard that there had been people jimmying with the SIR's and that somebody was changing the rankings as they liked."

"This is what I had been told by a professor," said Philliber.

"HE [THE PROFESSOR] is kind of biased. I had no idea if it would affect his grade. So we decided to find out for ourselves."

She continued, "We had a meeting the same day we got the handbill, so we discussed it. We decided this [the survey] would be the best way for us to find out if there was a difference between the rankings and salary."

Said Philliber about the survey, "We know it's not going to be totally accurate."

SEA asks to do survey to find top instructors

In a letter dated Dec. 9, 1980, addressed to Dr. Floyd Belk, vice-president for academic affairs, the Missouri Southern Student Educators Association requests permission to survey Southern students to gain their opinions as to who the best qualified instructors are at Missouri Southern. This action comes as a result of that group's receipt of a handbill issued by the NEA asking for response to the Board of Regents on the present faculty evaluation system.

"With the tensions on campus, the members of the Missouri Southern Student Educators Association would like to do a campus survey where students may choose the instructors they feel are best qualified to teach."

"We think it would be of interest to see if the instructors chosen by students would be congruent with the lists we are compiling of the top ten paid instructors on campus."

"WE DIDN'T WANT to write a letter or anything until we knew what it was all



It is Christmas; Chorale to sing

Final performance of the Annual Christmas Concert by the Missouri Southern Chorale will be at 8 tonight in Phelan's Recital Hall. Doors open at 7 for the free concert, and seating will be on a first-come, first-served basis.

In addition to Chorale, the Collegiate, a small select vocal ensemble will perform selections ranging from madrigals to Broadway show tunes. A featured composition is "Lullaby to Santa Claus." It includes five humorous songs whose texts are actual letters written by children to Santa Claus.

Although the Concert Chorale has followed the traditional concert format of performing a variety of contrasting compositions coming from different periods of musical history, it also sets these pieces within the framework of an all-encompassing theme.

The presentations often involve multimedia concepts. This fall's program mixes sacred and secular biblical literature with slides and narration from the Bible as a study in changing values during the lifespan of a man. As an individual ages,

his priorities and level of responsibility constantly change.

Secular forces that shape the individual are represented by such compositions as "Rhythm of Life" (from Sweet Charity), "Life Is Happiness Indeed" (from Leonard Bernstein's Candide), and "Pavane" by Gabriel Fauré.

The spiritual influences are emphasized in such selections as John Chorbajian's "The Lamb," "On God, and Not on Human Trust" by Pachelbel, and "Precious Lord, Take My Hand."

CIRUNA adopts resolution for NEA

CIRUNA, Missouri Southern's social science organization, yesterday adopted by unanimous vote a resolution supporting the local chapter of the National Education Association in its efforts to discontinue student evaluations of faculty used to determine faculty salaries.

Marie Censelaki, CIRUNA president, said the resolution was adopted without the knowledge of faculty sponsors. Copies of the resolution will be distributed to college administrators and regents today and faculty members across campus will receive copies probably tomorrow.

The resolution reads: "WHEREAS CIRUNA and its membership of history, political science, sociology, and geography students at Missouri Southern is gravely concerned

with the controversy surrounding student evaluations of faculty; seeing the student community has been ignored on their viewpoints misrepresented by non-students; and, therefore, CIRUNA publicly announces taking the initiative and becomes the first Missouri Southern student organization:

"OBSERVING that student welfare in the evaluation-salary conflict was not raised by Missouri Southern's administrators or Board of Regents members during debate on the issue at last November's Regents meeting;

"BEARING IN MIND that the student community has been burdened with an evaluation system attached to faculty salary and which asks students of vary-

ing educational backgrounds to make professional administrative decisions on higher education management;

"QUESTIONING 'WHY' this administrative responsibility was passed on to students;

"DISTURBED that warnings of considerable proportion as to faculty dissatisfaction with the proposed process was expressed prior to implementation and went unheeded;

"CONFUSED that Missouri Southern's administrators and Board of Regents now assert this is a new problem;

"RECOGNIZING that some students are unfortunately underachievers who

Continued on page 2

18 year-olds—did they vote in first election? Why?

By Sharon Caughlin

Recent presidential elections provided an opportunity for many college students to take advantage of their right as an American citizen by voting for the first time. Many students were 18 as of Nov. 4 and were eligible to vote. But how many took advantage of the right?

It was the custom of many, such as Jayne Duffy, a freshman at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln, to follow the party choice of their parents. "My parents are both Republican, and I grew up under the impression that the Republican Party was 'The Party,' so naturally, I never even heard of the Democratic Party."

She continued, "When election time came, I voted Republican because I knew all of Reagan's stands and opinions."

ANOTHER POINT of view comes from Joe Welke, a sophomore at the University of Nebraska—Omaha. States Welke, "My parents never did participate in any election, national or local, and I never held a high opinion of them for that."

He said that when his chance came to vote this past November he eagerly took advantage of his right, hopefully as a way of setting an example for his parents.

Of students polled on the Southern campus, the majority who did vote had a tendency to follow the party of their parents for many of the same reasons Duffy did. While attending college and concentrating on studying and the many activities associated with college, many students found it difficult to keep up with the presidential campaigns and issues as well as staying familiar with the many propositions and officials running for the many available offices in county and local elections.

ANOTHER FACTOR influencing students to vote as their parents would simply reflects growing up in an environment where all "good" is used referring to one party and all "negative" towards the other party or parties. At an early age a child may be influenced in the same way. As elections occur every four years, the child will grow up continuing to hear of one party only and form many of the

same ideas.

This is not to suggest that most students do follow their parents' point of view and are not able to decide for themselves. As Welke stated, "I was never pushed or influenced politically in any way by my parents. I decided for myself to vote and whom to vote for; I made it my own responsibility to find out all the issues and decide purely on my own."

Candidates in this year's elections influenced many people to go out and vote. Richard Williams, a Southern sophomore, voted for the second time this year. He is an "older" sophomore and has always been a Democrat, yet he voted for Anderson in the November election.

WILLIAMS, who feels "no vote is a wasted vote," marked his ballot for Anderson instead of for Carter "to show there is no political accord in this nation."


The opinion of Williams was shared by many students. Dissatisfaction with both Carter and Reagan caused many Southern students to vote for Anderson, who was clearly the Dark Horse, to make it evident to both major candidates that there are a lot of people who would rather neither Carter or Reagan in office.

Another view shared by many as a factor encouraging many students to vote was voiced by Paula Flesher, a freshman. "I voted in the presidential election because I feel it is my responsibility as an American citizen."

MANY FELT that since they are given the opportunity to take part in electing the head of the nation, then it is their responsibility to do so. To many it was an honor to be of legal age and able to vote, when in so many countries this freedom could not even be imagined.

When asked about county elections, of those polled, only a little more than half had participated, and most of these participants more or less voted unaware of the many issues and propositions.

Anne Nicolas, freshman, voted in the national election but said, "When it came to the county elections, I really voted blindly. In the local elections I more or less knew the proposals. It was all the candidates for offices such as sheriff and judge that I did not know anything



about."

THIS SEEMED to be typical of most students who voted in county elections. The proposals seemed to be well known and students were able to form their own opinions and stands, such as bingo and the closing of the nuclear power plant. When it came to the many offices and candidates eligible, most students either voted blindly or leaned towards their party.

Of the few students polled who did not vote, either nationally or locally, the reasons were varied.

Jana Brafford planned on voting but lives on campus and in registered in Monett. Her reason for not voting was

that she was unable to obtain an absentee ballot in time for the election deadline. She said: "I definitely will vote next time."


OTHER REASONS for not voting included not knowing the procedure to take for registering or how to even go about any process of the voting procedure. Many students also had no interest in voting either because they were not concerned with politics or felt it would be just a waste of time. When asked if any of these particular students, all of whom asked to remain anonymous, would participate in future elections, responses consisted of such phrases as "Maybe," "I don't know," and "It just depends."

From another view of students who did not vote, their justification was that they were dissatisfied with the choice of candidates that they chose not to vote in hopes of showing the nation that there are some people who did not feel any candidate was worth their vote. This excuse was common among non-voters as another way of showing dissatisfaction with the entire political system.

Results from the Southern survey as a whole showed much wide-spread dissatisfaction with the candidates for the past presidential election. Despite this fact, it is evident that many of the students able to vote for this first time did, and that they have the initiative to go out and vote.

Widow of Agent Orange victim describes symptoms

By Kevin Culli and Randall Mell



During the Vietnam War a herbicide was used called "Agent Orange." This particular herbicide was used to destroy vegetation that the enemy could be using for cover. Unfortunately, the government did not account what "Agent Orange" could do to humans exposed to it.

Yesterday Mrs. Sharon Wentz of Springfield spoke of "Agent Orange" and one man's fight to inform the nation about it.

Mrs. Wentz, widow of a victim of "Agent Orange," spoke to the Veterans Club in the Billings Student Center. She showed a film, *War Shadows*, and spoke of the effects of the herbicide. She urged veterans with symptoms of the resulting disease to go to the nearest VA hospital.

The active constituent of "Agent Orange" was a 50/50 mixture of two well-known herbicides sold separately for civilian use under the trade names 2, 4, 5-T and 2, 4-D. The respective generic names are trichlorophenoxyacetic acid and dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.

IF PERFECTLY PURE, neither of these materials would be classified as a dangerous poison when used as directed for defoliation. The toxicity attributed to "Agent Orange" resulted from the presence of a trace impurity known as tetrachlorodibenzoparadioxin known simply as dioxin. It was unintentionally introduced during the synthesis of the 2,4,5-T.

Dioxin is reputed to be one of the most

deadly man-made poisons, with lethal dosage estimated at one part per billion parts of body weight for mammals, including humans. This would be one ten-thousandth of a gram for a 220 pound man.

However, dioxin is a slow acting poison. Fatalities may not occur for months or even years after exposure unless dosage is considerably greater than the minimum dose. Its primary effect is to cause disintegration of the liver, skin, and other fatty tissues, with secondary effects including cancer and birth defects.

THE SYMPTOMS and effects of dioxin are as follows:

Chloracne: skin eruptions on the face, neck and back; loss of sensations in the extremities; nerve damage; fatigue, nervousness; irritability; intolerance to cold; palpable and tender liver; insomnia; loss of libido, vertigo, shortness of breath;

Headaches, upper respiratory distress, stomach and kidney pain, edema, gastric hyperplasia and ulceration, vascular lesions, gastric ulcers, severe depression, memory and concentration disturbances. And there are others.

BIRTH DEFECTS caused by dioxin include cleft palates, open eye, kidney abnormalities, enlarged liver, enlarged head, club foot, intestinal hemorrhage.

Cancer-causing and tumor-causing effects of dioxin include liver cell cancer, kidney cancer, cell carcinoma of the lung, carcinoma of the ear drum.

"Agent Orange" victims are worldwide, said Mrs. Wentz.

CIRUNA from page 1

may not evaluate faculty as to skill and performance but, rather, on their own poor showing in academics and using faculty as scapegoats;

"NOTING that we, as social science majors, have personally encountered non-majors with clear animosity toward required general education courses and such students participate in the evaluation not with intent of useful criticism but instead frustration in having to take the course;

"AWARE that some students mistakenly assume the evaluation will affect their grades and standing with faculty;

"SPECIFICALLY CONCERNED that upper division courses sometimes exist with a class size of only several students and these students fear evaluation anonymity will be lost and that fear is compounded when the students realize that they may have the same faculty the following semester;

"REALIZING that there is still question in the minds of both some students and faculty that evaluations can be altered;

"ACKNOWLEDGING that Missouri Southern's unit of the National Education Association is the professional facul-

ty organization at the forefront of this majority effort to rid both students and faculty of an unfair and impractical faculty evaluation system;

"ALARMED that Missouri Southern's Board of Regents have refused to meet and resolve the evaluation-salary dispute with MSSC-NEA representatives and, therefore, prolong a real and satisfactory end to the dispute;

"POINTING OUT that an institution of learning should encourage lively and open debate between all interested parties including Board of Regents members, administrators, faculty, additional campus personnel, students, alumni, and members of the outside community;

"BELIEVING that the student community needs and is entitled to some forum for evaluating faculty be constructive comment and toward class improvement but firmly holding that any such system which is used to determine faculty salary is not in the best interests of our education, and, therefore, CIRUNA:

"1. OPPOSES the continuation or implementation of any faculty evaluation by students which is used to determine salary;

"2. SUPPORTS the concept of a facul-

ty evaluation by students to improve instruction;

"3. ENCOURAGES educators to organize professionally for this and other issues so as to bring on healthy discussion and resolution of issues which in the past may have been decided without proper information or regard for all parties;

"4. RECOGNIZES MSSC-NEA as the legitimate representative of a substantial number of faculty who desire change in the evaluation process and are entitled to conference with the Board of Regents;

"5. RESPECTFULLY CALLS UPON Missouri Southern's Board of Regents to reconsider past unwillingness to meet with MSSC-NEA so that resolution is put off indefinitely until such a conference takes place with both parties allowed the courtesy of hearing each other;

"6. URGES all other campus organizations, individual students, faculty not already active, and members of the community to voice their opposition to faculty evaluation by students for salary determination;

"7. SUGGESTS FURTHER that interested persons follow the actions of CIRUNA by writing or calling Board of Regents members on the issue as well as attending Board of Regents meetings to monitor resolution."

4 day work week set for summer

Not only will summer school be a four-day week for students but also for campus employees.

The college administration has announced that a four-day work week during the summer months will be put into effect. Some direct saving in utility bills is expected but the biggest saving is expected to be in the 20 percent reduction of vehicle traffic to and from the college.

THE FACULTY will conduct summer classes on a Monday through Thursday schedule. Classes will begin at 7 a.m. and will last 75 minutes with a 15 minute break between classes. This will enable all classes to start on either the hour or half-

hour.

Administrative and staff personnel also will work Monday through Thursday except for Academic Services, Security, and some areas of Maintenance.

ACADEMIC SERVICES will maintain a minimal staff on Friday mornings.

Administrative and clerical staff will have the option of a 30 minute or 60 minute lunch break. If a 60 minute lunch period is selected, those individuals will work until 2 p.m.

Hours of 7 a.m. until 5:30 or 2 p.m. will be in effect from the end of the spring semester until the beginning of the fall semester.

NEA from page 1

student-faculty relationship in the classroom. I want that to be as good as it can be."

Said Boehning about the NEA's handling of the situation, "I want to be able to look back and be proud at what we did. We like this college, and we are doing what we think best to increase the quality of its education."

AS FOR THE RUMORS that these protests are aimed against certain ad-

ministrators, Boehning said, "We are not working against any certain administrator. We are working within the system to change it."

Boehning said that he has heard of a certain department sending a letter in support of a certain administrator throughout the department.

Said Boehning, "They sent a letter to him when we're not working against anybody. How do you think it makes that administrator feel?"

Television not their career but it provides their work

By Ramona Carlin

One business-majoring grandmother, two pre-dental biology majors, and one dental hygienist at Southern all have one thing in common: They are Southern's TV crew.

Given this information, one might ask, "Why would students in completely different fields of study want to spend their time and energy on something that they have no intention of having as a career?"

Well, as Mary Drees, one of the crew, put it, "We like working with people, and we know that what needs to be done for the students needs to be done."

Ann Farnar, a sophomore and a grandmother, decided to work for the micro-teaching facilities at Southern because she and W.L. Matthews, director of the TV lab, had been friends before she decided to go back to school for her business degree.

FARNER FEELS that she is a "Jack-of-all-trades." She works the control room and, if needed, she works with the cameras. "Matt (as Matthews is known by the crew) and I shot all the football games and occasionally I do remotes." Her main job with the teaching lab is secretarial work for Matthews.

Farnar does feel that she can incorporate the aspect of television into her business career. "It was kind of depressing to sometimes know more than your boss about business, but I couldn't advance until I had my degree."

Julie Leaverton, also a sophomore, heard about the micro-teaching lab through her roommate. "It sounded like a good opportunity so I came in and talked to the boss."

Leaverton is originally from Stockton, Calif., but came to Southern from Bolivar, Mo.

SHE SPENDS most of her extra time working for the lab, yet she has no intention of continuing in the television field. She, as well as the others, also spends a lot of extra time working at night.

"Sometimes things will be going on and we have to be here on short notice, but we rotate times and work around each other's schedules."

Kevin Howard's philosophy about his life is "the busier I stay then the less chance I have of becoming bored with school and less chance of my grades dropping."

Howard stays busy all right. He not only puts in his ten hours a week, but he is also a cheerleader and a pre-dental biology major.

He heard about this job through his affiliation with Southern's theatre.

HOWARD ALSO pointed out some interesting things about former crew members, such as in the past few years all but one of the members have been dental hygiene students or in the dental program. He also noted that out of the four current crew members, three are Catholic.

Mary Drees, a rifle in the Pride of MSSC, is from St. Louis and has had previous experience with computers and electronics. She feels that this is what made her interested in working for the lab.

A dental hygiene major, Drees puts in her ten hours a week without fail and feels that this experience of working with the TV cameras and controls has given her many opportunities to work with people. "Dental hygienists have to work with people and also it helps in that we have to work as a team doing what needs to be done for the students."

WHEN CONSTRUCTION is finished on the new television facility, the crew will have to be expanded. Leaverton explains, "It is hard enough for us now to handle the load, and we're always looking for help."

The crew has been praised through letters by numerous departments for their tireless efforts and dedication.

"This crew is possibly the best crew I've ever had," says Matthews. "We couldn't help as many people on campus as we do without them."



Kevin Howard, a student worker at Southern's TV lab, adjusts the color tone on a new portable color TV camera.

Term paper mills can ease pain

If you're spending sleepless nights agonizing over research papers while the assignments pile up, you must be wondering if there isn't a better way. There is. Located around Southern's campus were research paper advertisements that said just that.

Two different research paper companies have had their order forms placed on bulletin boards throughout Southern's campus. Although most of the ads have been taken down there are a few remaining.

One of the research paper ads, that still remains on a few bulletin boards, says that they have available, "thousands of quality research papers covering every college subject...all available through fast easy mail order." It also says "If a specific topic is not listed in our catalog, it can be written to your specifications by our expert staff." They also offer "editing and critique services" and can give you "thesis assistance on extensive projects."

"They were probably put up by a student," says Dr. Steven Gale, English department head. "When the order forms showed up they were discussed at two department heads meetings of Arts and Sciences." Gale then added, "The decision was made to have the research paper forms removed because they are not legally approved by the college."

"Nobody in my department has reported seeing one of these research papers," said Gale, "but we are aware of the possibility."

If a student in English class were suspected of turning in one of these research papers, then the student would be confronted by the teacher to admit the work is not his own. If the student admitted, then the teacher would take action. If the student would not admit what he had done, then, says Gale, "The student would probably eventually be confronted by the president of the college."

"On the surface the companies are not illegal," says Gale, "when a student turns in an order paper as his own, then it becomes illegal." He then noted Southern's student manual states that, "Cheating, falsification of documents and immoral conduct will not be tolerated."

Dr. Gale explained that "if I caught a student in a class that I teach with one of those papers, then that student would receive an automatic F." Another English teacher said, "I may give him a second chance to do his own work, but if he didn't get it in, then I would give him an F on the paper." Yet another teacher said, "I would give the student a zero F (an F receiving no points) to be averaged in with the rest of his grades. I would not give the student a second chance."

For a student to receive a listing of the papers available from the company, the ad includes the address to order a catalog for a small fee. The catalog received is a 336-page listing of over 10,000 papers the company has on file. The prices range three dollars per page for catalog research to eight dollars per page for custom research to forty dollars for a one-page outline with a bibliography.

If the prices seem a little high for the buyer, the company has available a trade-in allowance. For every paper buyers send the company, they receive two pages worth of credit on their catalog order. The company states that the trade-in must be

FOR SALE

American Drama—1920 to 1940

English 103
Miss Hoover
April 10, 1980

A student can buy almost any type of term paper he or she wishes on any subject. In fact, these paper mills will offer trade-ins on your old papers. Although they can be legally bought the can be illegally used.

five pages in length and must have footnotes and a bibliography.

In an editorial appearing in the past issue of Science magazine, Amitai Etzioni, with the Center for Policy Research Inc. of New York, discussed research paper companies. Etzioni explained that a study concluded, "Students at every major university in the country have access to at least one commercial firm that offers a variety of writing and research services ranging from term papers on any subject for undergraduates to M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations." Etzioni continued, "According to the study cited, because of demand for outstrips, supply sales are limited chiefly by the firms' inability to retain a sufficient number of qualified ghost writers. Other evidence showed that often this limitation was overcome by stealing papers from departmental offices and sold with already graded 'A' papers commanding the highest rate."

The article concluded with the statement that "several university ad-

ministrators and public officials engaged in short-lived, largely unsuccessful effort to close down the paper mills. Paper mill executives argued that they sold the papers as "research material only" and could scarcely be held responsible for the unethical usage many students made of them."

The ads on Southern campus say, in bold face type, "All materials are sold for research assistance only." This is exactly what the companies argued in the article mentioned.

On the order form received with the catalog it has a "contract" that the buyer is to sign. The contract states that the material he is buying from the research company is "designed and intended to be used solely for research and reference purposes."

As long as the buyer of the research paper uses it for research and reference purposes only, then it's legal. However, if the buyer turns in the paper as his own work, it then becomes illegal.

Nothing to do here? CUB does its best

By Judie Burkhalter

"I'm bored. There isn't anything to do."

These and other similar comments can be heard throughout the Missouri Southern campus. According to a large number of students at Southern, there just isn't anything to do on campus after classes are over. The students who are most likely to say something are those who stay on campus—the dormitory residents.

Southern is largely a commuter school with approximately 3,500 commuting students as opposed to about only 500 resident students. This is a factor in how much attendance there is at a nighttime event.

COMMUTING STUDENTS interviewed said they do not necessarily feel apathetic toward school events but rather are too busy with other activities to return to the campus at night. Kelly Swingle expressed the feelings of others when she said that "once I go home, I don't want to drive back." Commuting students said that a concert, however, would bring them back to campus.

Big name concerts like the students want are not feasible, according to Kathy Lay, coordinator of student activities. The students "just don't realize the cost of a concert," she said. If Southern were to have a big concert, there would not be any money left for other activities. College Union Board Chairman Glenn Edgin said that it can easily cost around \$30,000 to promote and conduct a major concert. A big group will cost probably \$20,000 with the famous bands and well-established names and current big-selling albums costing even more. Promotion for a big concert may run as high as \$10,000, according to Edgin. Advertising, lighting, sound, stage help, security, and sometimes transportation and room and board costs are negotiated in the contracts. With Taylor Auditorium holding only 2,000 people, a ticket to see a big group would probably cost between \$17 and \$23. It also costs \$27 an hour to rent the auditorium and, because of its small size, many groups will not even consider performing at Southern.

Edgin emphasized the need for the students to give the smaller acts a try and support the smaller concerts. He gave the Steve Martin concert as an example. "A few years ago we had Steve Martin on campus and six months later he became a big name."

BUT IF A BIG CONCERT is what the student wants, he will most likely have to travel to a nearby larger school. Southern administrators try to work with these schools in obtaining acts while they are in the area or will possibly in the future buy a number of tickets and charter a bus to the event, according to Dr. Glenn Dolence, dean of students. Lay said that Southern has saved about \$1,200 this year by booking groups with other area schools.

Dolence said that he does not feel that the lack of commuter-student participation is as great a factor as many make it seem. Assistant dean of students Doug

Carnahan agreed with this, saying it was "over emphasized." The absence of commuting students at events will have an effect on the turnout but can be understood since many commuting students work after school. This, and the fact that many dormitory students also work is a partial answer to the question of why students don't participate. To help curb this problem, C.U.B. has tried to initiate more daytime activities. So far one of the biggest turnouts this year was for a hypnotist who appeared during the day in the Lions' Den, according to Lay. She also added that the C.U.B. received positive comments on the show, and these help them to determine what the students want.

Edgin continued by saying that students who want something done should participate. "It's no easy for them to help. The best public relations is by word of mouth."

TO HELP with various activities, the C.U.B. has formed nine separate committees. These include the concert, coffeehouse, and cultural affairs committees which deal mainly with concerts; the dance committee, films, public relations, speakers, special events, and travel committees. These groups share the monies allotted in the C.U.B. budget. This funding comes only from student activity fees of which the C.U.B. receives 80 percent. With these funds, the C.U.B. attempts to create almost all of campus entertainment except sports.

Some of the upcoming C.U.B.-sponsored events will include the Christmas dance tonight, guest speakers Mel Blanc and Peter James, a former C.I.A. agent; a spring break trip to Daytona Beach, Fla., and a future float trip. The board is also trying to book the hypnotist again because of the large response. The Thursday evening movies will also continue to be held every three or four weeks. Future features include *The Jerk*, *Electric Horseman*, *Blue Lagoon*, *Honeysuckle Rose*, and *The Creature from the Black Lagoon*, which will be viewed with 3-D glasses. The C.U.B. is also working with the Student Senate to sponsor the first basketball Homecoming on Valentine's Day. The game that night will be with Washburn University.

There will be a spring concert March 27 featuring Mark McCollum and the Juggling Mizmos. The cost for students will be one dollar. Edgin said that he realized that money may be tight at times and the performing groups may not be well known, but still he feels that the students should "give them a try."

DOLENCE SAID that it is "the big things" that students want and will remember, however. He also said that the college just doesn't have the money or the facilities to host such events. He also feels that "for the size of the student body and for the money, we have as many activities" as other area schools.

Another possible alternative would be an open gym, according to many dormitory residents. Dolence said that the open gym policy was tried last year but

Continued on page 13

Opinion

On evaluations...

So much has been spoken recently about the NEA strife with the present evaluation system that it sometimes becomes difficult to uncover the matter at heart. The local NEA chapter has presented its protest by taking its complaints to the local news media in order to disclose their plight to those outside the college community. Yet, up to this moment little has been said by the college administration, a fact not at all surprising in a situation such as this.

However, the central point in this entire dilemma is the Missouri Southern student. Can he or she accurately evaluate teaching?

Yes, they had better be able to.

For some queer reason many faculty members, as seen in their comments on the recent Welfare Committee survey, view students as employees. Pity is deserving for the poor souls who made such comments. The fact of the matter is that the faculty, and administration are the employees of the students. Thus it is the responsibility of the students, as employers to evaluate the employees.

This rationale can be explained quite logically. A college is not in existence to provide jobs for those with advanced academic degrees; rather, it exists for the education of students, therefore creating a need for someone to educate them. Or in simpler terms, students pay to attend Missouri Southern; faculty members are paid to teach at Missouri Southern; so who works for whom?

By making such statements, The Chart runs the risk of being called a tool of the administration by those dissenting faculty members. That is not at all true. This editorial is not pointed toward the NEA nor the administration. It is pointed toward those ignorant students who have been convinced by overbearing and zealous faculty members that students cannot evaluate faculty.

If students let a group such as the NEA take their right of comment away (student evaluations), then what means is left to students to reward or disapprove of faculty actions? Basically none.

Basically the task of the NEA has been to deny the students a role in determining the pay of faculty members. If a student is taken in by this ploy, shame on him! The student is every year paying more and more of his or her college costs through tuition. Student evaluations are the only means by which students can have fair comment on how college money should be spent.

Students should be warned that this struggle is one of the NEA's attempting to convince the administration that we can't do our job as employers and evaluate them. This should be considered a total, not less than a damning, insult.

Students, unite! Nobody, it seems, in the faculty is apparently going to stand up for our rights as the paying members of the college to evaluate the ones we pay to teach us.

When a student enrolls in any college or university that student gives the officials, be they faculty, administrative, or student services, the right to control the student's environment. However, a student has the right to evaluate the means by which his or her environment is controlled. This is the purpose that student evaluations play.

Clearly then, any attempt, by anybody's part, to deny the students their right of fair comment should be viewed in contempt.

The present evaluation system is either good or bad depending on which end a person chooses to be placed. But there is only one opinion which can be taken in regard to students: That they have direct influence in the evaluation process.

Students must protect themselves; the students must lobby for more control in the evaluation of their faculty members. The students, not the faculty and administration, should be more concerned about the quality of education they receive. They must exercise tools to gain a higher quality of education. The student evaluation is the means by which this interest can be served.

**I swear,
student
evaluations
get worse
every year!**



CLARE SWANSON: Some ideas for a better dorm life

By Clark Swanson

Now that my roommates' girlfriends have an off-campus apartment, I have no roommates—which is fine, for silence has always been sweet to me. Dormitory living is an experience that should be repeated only once in life if one regards his sanity valuable. Yet from my experiences I offer some helpful suggestions which might be taken into consideration by the powers to be.

1. In the new residence halls, roll-away beds or hide-away beds should be installed. It has been my experience that overnight guests are quite common. Three-fourths of my nights were spent on that arthritic nightmare of a couch now found in my room.

2. Someone should burn that Pronto store to the ground. It is the closest thing to highway robbery since the Wild Rogers Turnpike. My friend, John, was aghast when being charged \$1.18 for a quart of Busch.

3. Room numbers should be more clearly marked and in larger type. On more than one occasion I have, while in the depths of a well-established drunk, been known to pound on doors wanting admittance since my key would not fit the lock and, upon entering, only to find that it is the wrong room, and the wrong building to boot.

4. All furniture should be constructed of rubber. More than once my body has been scarred by the cold edges of a vicious bed table.

IF SUCH IMPROVEMENTS were made my body would thank you and my doctor would damn you; he has made too much money off my dorm living experiences.

But no matter.

If there are any regrets to be voiced about this semester it would be that I didn't leave this place the day after I arrived. From all I have talked to, this semester has been one of lost loves, forgotten hopes, sudden binges of drunkenness. I knew things would go badly after the second night in the new dorms. That evening, at various establishments in Joplin, I managed to consume several bottles of beer and a pint of bourbon only to be driven home by a drunken, crazed madman who mistook sidewalks for interstate highways.

Finally, eight weeks into the semester, I burned out and decided it might be time to start attending classes; I still had my pink cards.

FURTHERMORE, I made the mistake of reading Voltaire and Locke. This only convinced me that life was meaningless and that hell my friends were God's wasted energy.

Yet there are those people who made this semester bearable for me. They, indeed, know who they are. Seemingly, I always meet them when I need a ray of hope and they, unknowingly, provided it for me.

What sanity my roommates beat out of me, these people restored through pleasant conversation and occasional drunkenness.

HOWEVER, IN ALL THIS madness the end is in sight. Home beckons and I shiver thinking about cable tv and boil-in-bags. Christmas is well and fine, but I long for New Year's Eve.

And while I shall miss those three or four friends that will be returning home for break, an old and dear friend will be coming home after a long absence in my life. It has been too long without this man's company, and I will dearly enjoy his return. Knowing he would return home made this semester a bit easier.

All-in-all this semester is over except for a few formalities of which all academic institutions partake. Originally, I had planned this to be my farewell column. With luck, I thought, The Chart could be turned over to a younger person more suited for its long hours of insanity. I had wished to retire and enjoy a semester of being a normal studious student. However, those plans have fallen through, so the old pro will return for one last act.

JULIAN BOND: Reagan did not really win election

By Julian Bond

You probably thought that Ronald Reagan defeated Jimmy Carter on Nov. 4.

So did John Chancellor of NBC, who announced Reagan's victory on Election Night before many Americans had even made their preference known. And so did Walter Cronkite of CBS, who confirmed NBC's pronouncement two hours later.

At first even Jimmy Carter thought Reagan had whipped him. He telephoned his congratulations and delivered a concession speech before the West Coast polls had closed. And now he is helping Reagan prepare for his January takeover.

REAGAN, TOO, thinks he handed Carter the greatest Electoral College rout since Richard Nixon's over George McGovern in 1972. The former actor has been acting presidential ever since.

Sen. Howard Baker, R-Tenn., also thinks that Reagan crushed Carter. In the lame-duck session of Congress, the new majority leader sought to enact Reagan's legislative proposals before the new president would even sworn in.

Even Sammy Davis, Jr., must think that Reagan won. He has begun to "process" his hair again in a fashion popular among black men in the 1950s, the era when Reagan's world view was formed and frozen.

In fact, people everywhere believe that Reagan will soon replace Carter in the most powerful office on earth.

CONFIDENTIALLY, I thought so too.

Guess what? We were all wrong. It was Sen. Edward Kennedy who beat Carter, that's who.

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., says it was the Massachusetts senator and "doctrinaire" Democrats who shellacked Carter. According to Moynihan, Kennedy and, especially, his "vigorous supporters" caused the defeat of the president and his party.

Carter cronies Charles Kirbo and Griffin Bell also believe it was Kennedy who beat Jimmy and Rosalynn back to Plains.

BELL DOESN'T BLAME only Kennedy, however. The former attorney general says it was the senator and "ethnics" and gay people and other specified groups who forced the Georgia Man into the unemployment line.

Within a few days of the election, even Carter had begun to reassess his original view that Reagan had triumphed on Election Night.

It's no wonder so few Americans bother to vote. When a man who isn't even on the ballot can vanquish his Senate colleagues and an incumbent president while cleverly pretending to support them, it's only logical that growing numbers of voters have become cynical about the political process.

KENNEDY FOOLED US ALL by campaigning across the country for Carter and his endangered fellow Democrats. He even adroitly raised money for Carter in an apparently successful attempt to convince the voters that he really wanted Carter to win.

I'll bet Kennedy even voted the straight Democratic ticket, knowing all along that he—not Carter, Reagan, or John Anderson—would be declared the winner a few days after the election.

The Carter cure for the successful Kennedy candidacy—which most of us thought had ended in Iowa last January—is to throw the senator's forces out. And since Kennedy and his "vigorous supporters" removed Carter from the White House, Moynihan, Kirbo, Bell, and some others would like to remove Kennedy and Company from any position of leadership in the Democratic Party and repudiate the liberal positions they stand for.

THERE IS A CERTAIN politically poetic justice to it all, however.

Herbert Hoover has been beating members of his party in life and death since 1922. In fact, the man has been the first election in nearly half a century in which "The Great Engineer" did not manage to pull down his fellow Republicans.

It is certainly the first one in which a Hoover heir—that is, Reagan—adopted Franklin D. Roosevelt's rhetoric to defeat the standard-bearer of the Roosevelt coalition.

And it will probably be the last election in which New Deal slogans are sounded to summon that coalition together—the last election, in fact, for the coalition Hoover helped to create almost 60 years ago.

But if Kennedy really beat Carter, who is going to tell Reagan?

And how is he going to break the news to Nancy?



The Chart

The Chart, the official newspaper of Missouri Southern State College, is published weekly, except during holidays and examination periods, from August through May, by students in journalism as a laboratory experience. Views expressed in The Chart do not necessarily represent the opinions of the administration, the faculty, or the student body.

CLARK SWANSON Editor-in-Chief

Ramona Carlin Associate Editor

nea versus the administration

An in-depth examination

That some members of the Missouri Southern faculty are talking about collective bargaining, and that a local chapter of the National Education Association, the nation's largest teachers' union, is active, should come as no surprise to college administrators.

A February, 1979, report of an Ad-Hoc Committee on Evaluations said then that changes in the faculty evaluation system were needed "and that unless changes were made, the College could well be inviting more serious morale problems for the future with unionization among the alternatives some faculty would suggest."

THE REPORT went on to recommend "that across-the-board pay raises shall apply when the monies available do not exceed the current rate of inflation."

Committee members expressed their rationale this way: "... dissatisfaction (among the faculty) exists because of the basic belief that in these days of the inflationary spiral and increasing cost of living expenses, that the principal concern of the college administration should be to provide, to the best of its ability, cost of living or across-the-board increases which approximate the inflationary spiral. To do otherwise... is to further penalize the satisfactory teacher who, with only a slight increase, falls further behind in keeping up with expenses. Thus it would appear that it becomes necessary for all to recognize the desires of many faculty members that the college first provide cost of living increases and that, monies permitting, rewards of recognition be given to the superior faculty members as a one time, and one time only, bonus."

The local NEA chapter has stated what it believes to be "an urgent need to... (provide a fair salary increase for all faculty members which would not be less than the rate of increase in the cost of living."

The evaluation committee's report reiterated its point in the final paragraph of the document: "Finally, in a re-emphasis of a previous statement, this committee feels strongly as do a vast majority of the faculty that, in these days of double-digit inflation and spiraling price increases, it is unwise and unrealistic not to give serious consideration to the concept of general across-the-board salary increases with merit bonuses being reserved for those who are indeed meritorious. But the word bonuses becomes crucial in the proper understanding of this concept, for it is generally felt that meritorious

service should be honored only by a one-time payment and that it not become part of the base salary of a faculty member. We are [not] ignoring past arguments in favor of merit increases. We are stating simply that in 1979 with the economic picture of the nation as it is that the past systems of granting merit increases are themselves without merit."

IN PARTIAL RESPONSE to the committee's recommendations, there were established last year, through the Missouri Southern Foundation, two awards of \$1,000 each to the outstanding faculty member on campus and to the outstanding teacher of a freshman subject.

Current feeling, however, among many members of the NEA is that all merit should be awarded on the same basis: A one time and one time only payment.

The history of faculty evaluation on the Missouri Southern campus is not an old one. It goes back only to the 1973-74 school year when the idea was introduced of using student evaluations in classrooms for "improvement of instruction." There were indications, some faculty felt, that there was a promise made to use student evaluations for pay considerations. Since some departments already used student evaluations regularly, there was no major opposition to the concept. But opposition did begin to develop when a standardized campus-wide form was introduced. Those departments which had used student evaluations had used forms of their own devising, planned specifically for their respective disciplines. The standardized form, however, asked the same questions of all students, regardless of the class, and were graded against national norms by disciplines. Comparisons were made, then, of how Southern faculty members compared with the national norm in their disciplines. Since not all institutions across the nation using the standardized form structured their offerings in the same way as Southern, the national norms for some disciplines were actually norms for related fields of study and sometimes were based on a relatively few number of students. Norms for English, mathematics, on the other hand, were generally based on large numbers of student responses across the nation since most colleges offer these disciplines with these titles.

THUS, NORMS VARIED. Some norms were high, some were low, and

others proved difficult for some faculty members to accept. Added to that, in the minds of many faculty, was the fact that at Missouri Southern once a comparison was made of a faculty member to the national norm in his discipline, he was then compared across campus with faculty members in other disciplines.

It was because of these factors, and others, that the 1979 report recommended the abandonment of that particular standardized form and the use of a locally devised form.

It is that new form that was used last year and again this year. It consists of nine questions and allows students the opportunity to comment more fully on each question in a second part of the form.

Now that form has come under attack. But the attack may be less directed against the form than against the entire subject of student evaluations.

THE QUESTION of validity of student evaluations emerges as one of the central issues of the open debate on evaluation. At the heart of this discussion is a philosophical question of the real role of the student in the educational system and whether the student is or is not the central focus of the institution. Most NEA members nationwide dispute this statement as indeed being an issue.

Another issue is the capability of students to make judgements of the nature required. Can, indeed, a first semester student distinguish between good college teaching and good high school teaching? Do freshmen expect the same type of teaching in college that they had in high school? Are only upper-division students capable of making these judgements?

Too, it is asked, won't students unfairly evaluate teachers of required courses as opposed to elective classes or classes in their own major field of interest? Are teachers of general education courses penalized by student evaluations?

A GREAT DEAL OF RESEARCH has been done on student evaluations nationwide, and researchers who have come to the conclusions that student evaluations are generally not valid say that many factors seemingly extraneous to teaching per se influence the results. Researchers say that the size of the class, the hour of the day, the likeability of the teacher, hard or easy grading practices, the student's

major, the student's year in school, all affect student ratings.

One researcher has even suggested that forcing students to think has a negative impact on ratings. An engineering professor is quoted in a 1975 issue of Science as offering persuasive evidence that he could manipulate his student ratings downward by lecturing on complementary material not covered in the text and giving exams which required students to integrate the material; he could send ratings back up by confining his lectures to the text and his exam questions to factual material. In short, he concluded, even if we believe students rate good teachers highly there is plenty of evidence to indicate that the reverse inference is correct.

NEA members on campus contend that because of this fact faculty members lower their standards, causing grade inflation, and are less demanding of students, teaching "to the test" rather than what the student should learn.

THE "DR. FOX" studies created something of a stir in academia a few years ago. As described in *The Center Magazine* five years ago, they were concerned with how the personality of the lecturer and the content of the lecture affect student ratings. The first paper, subtitled "A Paradigm of Educational Seduction," described the ratings a professional audience gave to Dr. Fox. Dr. Fox was in fact an actor who had been programmed ahead of time to give a nonsensical lecture ("Mathematical Game Theory as Applied to Physician Education") in a very personable and entertaining manner. The audience rated his lecture as informative and excellent.

In a follow-up study Dr. Fox delivered a low-content lecture in both a "high seductive" and "low seductive" style. They also had him deliver a high content lecture both ways. They found that when Dr. Fox spoke in the highly seductive manner—flamboyantly, with lots of jokes, smiles, and movement—he received very high student ratings regardless of the content of his lecture. Only in the more straightforward lectures did content make any difference in student ratings.

Thus, a student should ask himself: Am I being impressed more by the style of the presentation than by the content? Have I developed my analytical skills sufficiently to make such a judgement? Does the teacher who makes the classroom fun

really teach me anything? Does the one who bores me and scares me teach me anything?

AND WHILE THAT DEBATE over student evaluations goes on, another question seems to be at the heart of the Missouri Southern situation. That one involves administrators. The Missouri Southern chapter of the NEA said in its first news release on Nov. 21: "This protest action is necessary to call attention to the incompetent central administration which has devised such a ridiculous evaluation procedure and foisted it on the teaching faculty. Perhaps this series of protests will also encourage the Board of Regents to make changes and bring enlightened, responsible management to Missouri Southern State College."

That question also was addressed in the February, 1979, report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluations: "Here then we come to another nagging concern—the great amount of dissatisfaction expressed by faculty members with administrators. There were strong and repeated suggestions received by this committee that administrators are paid to administer and therefore must administer. If they cannot, they should be removed or they should be schooled. Probably the most repeated comment made was that the department heads should undergo training in the evaluation of teaching performance and in the aiding of those persons falling short of their expectations. We would strongly suggest, therefore, that short courses or seminars be held for one or two week periods each summer for department heads in evaluation and administrative procedures."

NEA members claim that many of the faculty's disagreements with the present evaluation system have fallen "on deaf ears," that administrators have ignored their pleadings and suggestions.

WHATEVER the chief disagreements are over—whether they be concerned with student evaluations, administration competency, or use of evaluations for merit pay—the total system is now in serious question.

And the efforts of NEA to change the situation may lead to a major confrontation between some faculty members and the Board of Regents.

The 1979 report indicated that such a confrontation was likely at some future point. That future point appears to be now.

Faculty give responses

On Nov. 11, the Faculty Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate distributed a questionnaire to faculty members asking their opinions on the faculty evaluation system. Statistical results of that questionnaire were announced in the last edition of *The Chart*. Faculty members also, however, had the option of writing in comments on each question. Last week, faculty members received a copy of the "consolidated comments from the evaluation system survey." Here are those comments:

QUESTION 1: Do you feel that the present evaluation system measures your performance accurately enough to determine merit pay on a point to point basis?

"Administrators are responsible for the evaluation of the faculty; we they ask the students to do it for them. The faculty is guilty until they can prove their innocence."

"I do not perform by points or numbers. I love my work; this evaluation is set up to prove otherwise."

"9 questions don't cover the whole range of teaching effectiveness or the lack of it."

"Get rid of points and merit under the present structure. Student evaluation is all right as a tool for improvement of instruction."

"The system has many inherent problems; personalities often become a factor of the evaluation; the faculty member may opt to gear his performance toward evaluations."

"Every part of this instrument is subjective and difficult if not impossible to accurately quantify."

"Students largely are not qualified to rate the instructor."

"I welcome evaluation and student input for the sake of self improvement."

"The student evaluation form has not

been tested for reliability and validity."

"I feel that it is a very unsophisticated attempt to quantify skills which must be measured by a more precise and complex means."

"Every department has a certain uniqueness in teaching methods which can't be evaluated in the same manner as in another department. Evaluation systems need to be tailored to the needs of the individual department."

QUESTION 2: Do you believe that the teaching faculty in all areas of the college should be evaluated by the same instrument?

"Items on the instrument may not apply equally in all areas, but it would be harder to justify the equivalence of different instruments."

"Some departments have instructors that are very talented in their field, but are they teachers? Do students evaluate the skills of the teaching? Our present instrument is not fair in either instance."

"When skill performances are being developed, ten weeks is too early to administer the evaluations."

"General education and upperdivision courses should be evaluated differently."

"The unique differences between disciplines are not revealed by a norm."

"Technical and activity classes need a different instrument than classroom type classes."

"There are too many variables."

"A number of teaching faculty must be multi-faceted in teach certain skills and knowledge in their discipline."

"This point was proven at the workshop I attended this week. Student evaluation should be used for the improvement of instruction. Administrators should be trained in the quality of teaching."

QUESTION 3: Do you believe that the student evaluation form is an exact measure of your teaching abilities so that each point can be assigned a dollar value?

"The students think it is a farce and I predict most scores will be high this semester."

"Until a student has been a teacher they are aware of only one side—theirs."

"Student evaluations should not be linked to merit pay."

"Students in their first/second semester classes cannot know about criteria for judging college teaching vs. high school teaching."

"The student is too subjective, too easily influenced by immediate circumstances to be objective."

"Course content, required as an elective course, time of day for class, number of evaluations a student had already done

that day are all variables that can affect the outcome on the evaluation."

"Student evaluation measures primarily how much the student personally likes the teacher and how well he likes the subject matter. It is very unfair to teachers of large, lower division, general education requirement courses."

"The critical qualities of a teacher are included but they are too often misinterpreted by students whose level of maturity and seriousness varies enormously."

"A student can only measure the atmosphere in classroom and that is too subjective."

"I doubt students' qualifications to respond meaningfully to most of the questions on ICES."

"The evaluation measures perceptions which are based on subjective factors."

"Too great a reliance on bias with no solid or valid discrimination insure objectivity."

QUESTION 4: Do you believe that the administrative evaluation part is an accurate measure of your contribution to the college?

"Many times I have contributed in various ways to the college in a manner which is not measured by the administrative evaluation."

"Because the evaluation instrument has a set of predetermined behaviors which is not the total account of possible desirable behaviors."

"Committee assignments are not available to all faculty members."

"The administrative evaluation is impossible to administer—unless you use answers of students on the ICES."

"This is an loaded with ridiculous restrictions and ambiguities that I don't see how any department head can make meaningful ratings and comparisons."

"The administration of this portion of the evaluation is not necessarily uniform across campus; the assignments of points is very subjective."

"If the proof is on the teacher, we don't need administrators. This documentation is a paper waste and time-robbor."

"I think it is reasonable; we would probably use the same, or similar criteria had the faculty developed the instrument."

"It attempts to establish guidelines that are highly artificial, rigid and that reduces the element of subjective evaluation by the department head. The sliding scale between administrative and student evaluation is poorly conceived and rendered largely useless or even downright harmful by requiring the teacher to choose his ratio in advance. It is little more than a form of gambling."

"I don't feel we need to drag out all of

Continued on page 7

Chronology of actions by NEA

Following is a chronology of publicly issued statements by the Missouri Southern chapter of the National Education Association concerning evaluation:

Dated Oct. 27, 1980, the following letter was sent to William Schwab, Jr., president of the Southern Board of Regents:

"Dear Mr. Schwab:
"The NEA Chapter of Missouri Southern State College has met and after careful consideration has determined that use of the present faculty evaluation system must be discontinued immediately. We can no longer accept the concept of such an evaluation system being attached to pay."

"Insofar as we no longer accept such a system and since past salary adjustments have been so woefully inadequate in terms of inflation, it is our position that the next year's salary adjustment for all faculty members shall not be less than the rate of increase in the cost of living."

"We are willing and ready to meet with you concerning this matter. Because of the critical nature of this issue, we shall expect your response by Monday, November 10, 1980. If a satisfactory response has not been received by this date, we shall call a meeting to discuss further action."

"Sincerely, yours,
"MSSC-NEA
"Rochelle Boehning
"President"

A response was received by the NEA group from Mr. Schwab, but the contents of that response were never made public. It was stated that the response had been that the NEA chapter should follow proper channels and go through the college administration with its grievance.

Next, a news release dated Nov. 21,

1980, and appearing in letterhead stationery of the Missouri NEA was sent to local news media. That release read:

"A crisis has developed at Missouri Southern State College. MSSC-NEA, the faculty organization, is preparing for the crisis. Protest activities will commence and continue as long as necessary until the Board of Regents discontinues the current evaluation procedure, and provides fair salary increases for the faculty."

"The current evaluation system the problem. It forces the students to evaluate the faculty, which in turn determines the salary which the faculty members receive. In effect, the faculty must negotiate with the students for their salary."

"Evaluation of faculty is an administrative function which is being performed by the students, but the administrators have not increased their salaries even though they have reduced their jobs."

"The evaluation also permits the President of the College to disregard the results of the student's evaluation if he so wishes. It appears that the President who approves the evaluation does not trust it."

"This protest action is necessary to call attention to the incompetent central administration which has devised such a ridiculous evaluation procedure and foisted it on the teaching faculty. Perhaps this series of protests will also encourage the Board of Regents to make changes and bring enlightened, responsible management to Missouri Southern State College."

A memorandum dated Nov. 22, 1980, and also appearing in letterhead stationery of the Missouri NEA was delivered to all faculty with a copy of the news release. That memorandum stated:

"The MSSC-NEA Crisis Committee made one final attempt to resolve the present evaluation crisis with the president of the Board of Regents. He refused to take any action to resolve the problem."

"As a result, the Crisis Committee has taken the next step, which was adopted by MSSC-NEA. That step was to announce to the media some of our concerns."

"Our plans will progress until this problem is resolved."

Then a letter was sent to all faculty members from the "MSSC-NEA Crisis Committee." Dated Nov. 26, 1980, it also was on letterhead stationery from the Missouri NEA and read as follows:

Continued on page 8

The System in Use

Beginning in the column on the right, and continuing for the next three pages is a step-by-step explanation of the Faculty Evaluation System in use for 1980-81. Percentages assigned to the three main categories are the same as in the past: 70 percent on teaching (to be determined by student evaluations and administrative appraisal) and 30 percent on college and professional activities. In the past, these percentages were stringently assigned: 45 percent from student evaluations, 25 percent from administrative, 15 from college service, and 15 from professional activities. This year, however, a faculty member has a choice in what percentage of his total evaluation is to come from student evaluations.

Chronology continues

"As you probably know, your colleagues in the MSSC-NEA, notified the Board of Regents that 'We have had enough, and we aren't going to take it anymore.' We are referring to the current evaluation procedure that forces students to determine faculty salaries.

"In years past, through regular administrative channels, we have protested, either as individuals or in small groups, the use of this unfair, ill-conceived evaluation procedure. Cosmetic changes were made, but the basic student determination of salaries by directly linking student evaluation to faculty pay remained a part of the procedure. Some of the faculty who registered complaints were told, in effect, 'If you don't like it here, then leave.'

"Recently, the MSSC-NEA sent a letter to the Board of Regents stating the urgent need for:

"1. Eliminate at once, the current faculty evaluation procedure.

"2. Provide a fair salary increase for all faculty members which would not be less than the rate of increase in the cost of living.

"We asked to meet with the Board to discuss these changes. The Board refused and instructed us to go through regular administrative channels by meeting with President Darnton.

"President Darnton helped develop this evaluation procedure through his committee on evaluation and did not allow the Faculty Senate to vote on the matter, stating that this was the work of his committee. President Darnton informed the faculty that evaluation of their pay was a Board policy. The faculty informed the school Deans of our dissatisfaction with this policy. The Deans conveyed these concerns to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Apparently their words and our input fell on deaf ears. Since faculty efforts to persuade the President to eliminate the current procedure have failed, MSSC-NEA has chosen another alternative.

"On Friday November 21, 1980, the MSSC-NEA Executive Committee, through our spokesman, Arnold Erickson, telephoned Mr. William Schwab, President of the Board of Regents, asking for ten minutes, at his convenience, for an informal meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to impress upon him that we could not accept the Board's directive to use regular administrative channels by meeting with President Darnton. And further, that with no immediate alternative, the MSSC-NEA was prepared to begin a series of protest actions. We assured Mr. Schwab that if he were willing to call other Board members to reconsider their position, we would not initiate protest activities until we heard from the Board. We told Mr. Schwab that if he would pledge the Regents' consideration of this problem we would postpone our protest. Mr. Schwab refused to consider our proposals, forcing us to conclude that the Board of Regents was insensitive to faculty concerns with the evaluation procedure.

"Having no other recourse, the MSSC-NEA notified the local and area news media about the crisis that has developed at MSSC. We are notifying state and national media as well. The MSSC-NEA will coordinate a series of protest activities that will continue until the current evaluation process is abandoned and until the faculty receives fair salary increases. We still seek to establish communication with the Board of Regents.

"By failing to hear faculty concerns, President Darnton and his administration have forced faculty to organize to protect itself. The days and weeks ahead will be difficult for the MSSC-NEA faculty, but they will be less difficult if we all stay together. The current crisis cannot last forever, and we hope that each of us can look back with

pride at personal contributions in resolving these issues and restoring dignity to education at MSSC."

On Wednesday, Dec. 3, leaflets were distributed on campus and in town. The leaflets read, in bold type: "YOUR COLLEGE NEEDS YOUR HELP." In smaller type, in boxes were these words: "A crisis has developed at MSSC. The current evaluation created the crisis. It forces the students to evaluate the faculty, which in turn determines the salary which faculty members receive. This is an administrative job that should not be delegated to students. We need your help to get this system stopped and instead let the professors concentrate on excellence in teaching." And, "If you feel as we do, call one of your regents and tell him to drop this evaluation system: In Joplin, William Schwab, President, 623-8865; Fred Hughes, 623-1633; Jerry Wells, 623-7752; Glenn Wilson, 623-5392. In Carthage: Ray Orata, 358-4669; In Sarcoux, Loren Olson, 548-2710." At the bottom of the leaflets in small type were the words: "Please Do Not Litter" and "Distributed by MSSC-NEA."

Then state and national news media received an official "Missouri NEA News Release" dated Dec. 2, 1980, and listed as "For Immediate Release." That news release read as follows:

"A dispute between the Board of Regents and the faculty organization at Missouri Southern State College, Joplin, has reached a point of no return according to Missouri Southern State College-NEA (MSSC-NEA). The dispute is over faculty evaluation procedures.

"MSSC-NEA has formed a Crisis Committee to coordinate protest activities. According to Dr. Buckner Boehning, MSSC-NEA President, 'Protest activities will commence immediately and continue as long as necessary until the Board of Regents discontinues the current faculty evaluation procedure, and provide fair salary increases to the faculty.'

"Protest activities to include making public the faculties' concerns and leafletting the community. Future activities remain unspecified.

"The current evaluation procedure requires students to evaluate faculty. The student evaluations in turn are used to determine the salary which faculty members receive. MSSC-NEA objects, saying that the evaluation procedure, in effect 'puts the faculty in the position of negotiating their salary increases with the students.' The association maintains that evaluation is an administrative function.

"The evaluation procedure also permits the President of the College to disregard the results of the student evaluation in particular cases if he so desires. According to MSSC-NEA, allowing the President to disregard the student evaluations of some faculty members makes the procedure even less valid, and gives the President the authority to discriminate.

"This protest is necessary to call attention to the incompetent central administration which has devised such a ridiculous evaluation procedure and forced it on the faculty," says Dr. Boehning. "Perhaps this series of protests will also encourage the Board of Regents to make changes and bring enlightened, responsible management to Missouri Southern State College."

"MSSC-NEA is affiliated with the 13,000 member Missouri NERA and the 1.6 million member National Education Association."

Next, on Friday, Dec. 5, 1980, the following memorandum was sent to "Student Organizations": "The Student Senate is considering a resolution in support of the MSSC-NEA position on evaluation. Your support is also needed.

"We urge you to take action on this matter through your executive board or membership and write a letter to the Board of Regents. We urge your members to call members of the Board to support the evaluation system. Please urge your membership to protest in any other way you believe would be effective."

The following is the evaluation system in use at Missouri Southern at the present time. It was developed by a committee appointed by President and reporting directly to him. It is this system which the Missouri Southern chapter on NEA is asking be discontinued because "It forces the students to evaluate the faculty, which in turn determines the salary which faculty members receive. In effect, the faculty must negotiate with the students for their salary."

STEP ONE:

In September each faculty member received an 11-page document entitled "1980-1981 Faculty Evaluation Procedures." This packet contained: An Evaluation Calendar, outlining the sequence of events and the time schedule for the evaluation process; a section labeled Faculty Evaluation, which set forth the premise for evaluation and included details on the measurements of each step; a copy of the Instruction and Course Evaluation questions, both Parts I and II; a copy of the activities assessment form; a "contract" to be signed by each faculty member selecting the weight he wished to have assigned to student evaluations and to activities assessment; and a statement entitled "Annual Salary Increases." Each of these sections will be explained in detail in the following procedures.

STEP TWO:

Faculty members met by departments to go over the evaluation system. It was explained that there were three categories in evaluation, worth a total of 100 points: Instruction and advising, 70 points; professional service, 15 points; and college service, 15 points. Each faculty member was given an opportunity to elect relative values of the student evaluation and the administrative evaluation, as well as selecting relative values for professional service and college service. The "contract" which each faculty member was asked to sign is reproduced here. Note that a faculty member could have selected as little as 30 percent of the total evaluation to be based on student evaluations, or as much as 60 percent. Administrative evaluation by the department head could count as little as 10 percent or as much as 40 percent. The percentages selected must total 70. Similarly, a faculty member could elect to have college service count as little as 10 percent or as much as 20 percent, with the same percentages being available for professional service. The two percentages here must total 30.

FACULTY EVALUATION 1980-1981

PART I (To be filled out in September or October)

Procedures below will allow the faculty member to select values (within parameters) in each of the four parts of the instrument.

Directions: Circle the selected value on each part and sign below.

Student Evaluation	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	Must
Administrative Evaluation	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	Total
								70
College Service	10	15	20					Must
Professional Service	10	15	20					Total
								30

(Signed: Faculty Member)

(Signed: Department Head)

PART II (To be filled out in March or April)

	Raw Score	Divided by	Multiplied by	Equals
			Chosen Value	Derived Score
Student Evaluations	45	x		
Administrative Evaluations	20	x		
College Service	15	x		
Professional Service	15	x		
TOTAL				

(Signed: Department Head)

(Signed: Faculty Member)

STEP THREE:

During the week Nov. 3-7 the student evaluations were administered. The specific date for administration of the student evaluation was selected by the faculty member concerned. Administration of the form could have been by a previously selected student, a department head, or a colleague. There were nine questions, and a student was to rate the faculty member on each question on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Along with two IBM cards, identical except for the color, a student received an open ended questionnaire on which the student could comment on why each question was answered the way it was.

Item	Course Number	Course Title	Instructor	Time	Date	Room
INSTRUCTION & COURSE EVALUATION						
The purpose of this questionnaire is to assist your instructor in improving his or her teaching ability and to assist the College in understanding the performance of your instructor. Please evaluate the teaching you have had this semester in the same careful, thoughtful manner which you expect the teacher to use in evaluating your work.						
PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS (Circle a Single Response for Each Question)						
How would you rate:						
1. The instructor's mastery of the course content?	1	2	3	4	5	
2. The methods used by the instructor in the presentation of the course material?	1	2	3	4	5	
3. The fairness of the instructor's method of evaluation and grade determination?	1	2	3	4	5	
4. The instructor's use of allotted class time?	1	2	3	4	5	
5. How well the instructor followed the course objectives as stated by the instructor and course syllabus?	1	2	3	4	5	
6. The instructor's courtesy and respect for students?	1	2	3	4	5	
7. The instructor's attitude toward the course?	1	2	3	4	5	
8. The opportunity to increase your knowledge from the material presented in this class?	1	2	3	4	5	
9. The overall effectiveness of the instructor?	1	2	3	4	5	

STEP FOUR:

During the week of March 23 the student evaluations will be repeated for second semester classes.

STEP FIVE:

On April 8, the Activities Assessment sheet will be distributed to each faculty member. Faculty members will list their activities in college and professional service and prepare for the conference with their department head.

ACTIVITIES ASSESSMENT

In addition to an acceptable performance in the classroom, the instructor serves both his college and his profession. With significant input from the department head, a self-analysis from the instructor will allow an accounting of these activities.

Professional Activities (16 points)

1. Professional Writing and Presentations
 - A. Publication of Book (Approved by Department Heads and School Deans)
 1. First year—10 points ea.
 2. Second year—10 points ea.
 3. Third year—5 points ea.
 - B. Publication of a Scholarly Article in a refereed journal (approved by Department Heads and School Deans)
 1. First year—8 points ea.
 2. Second year—4 points ea.
 - C. Paper presented to relevant professional meetings
 1. National level—5 points ea.
 2. Regional level—3 points ea.
 3. Local level—1 point ea.
 - D. Curricular materials professionally published (workbooks, teaching aids, study guides, etc.)—5 points ea.
 - E. Submitted but unpublished material—3 points ea.
 - F. Program appearances (e.g. moderator, presenter, discussant)
 1. National level—2 points ea.
 2. Regional level—1 point ea.
 3. Local level—1 point ea.
 - G. Recitals, exhibits, etc., presented to public
 1. National level—5 points ea.
 2. Regional level—3 points ea.
 3. Local level—1 point ea.
2. Self Improvement
 - A. Course work relevant to one's discipline approved by Department Head or School Dean—3 points per course
 - B. Workshops, seminars, continuing education courses, etc., related to one's discipline (not to exceed 2)—1 point ea.
 - C. A specific plan developed and approved in the fall semester within the department—2 points max.
3. Leadership in relevant professional organization (election to office, committee chairmanships, committee membership)
 - A. National level—10 points max.
 - B. Regional level—5 points max.
 - C. Local level—2 points max.
4. Professional evaluation (Active Journal Referee, Active Project Evaluator, Accreditation Teams)
 - A. National level—5 points max.
 - B. Regional level—3 points max.
 - C. Local level—2 points max.
5. Academic Participation (Development, preparation, and direction of seminars, workshops, colloquia, . . . not in-house. . .)—2 points max.
6. Consulting activities—2 points max.
7. Awards and Honors related to profession (Scholarly awards, stipends, fellowships, grants, etc.)—1 point max.*

*up to 3 additional points may be awarded by all Departments and School Deans
8. Relevant professional organization membership (not to exceed 2)
 - A. National level—1 point ea.
 - B. Regional level—1 point ea.
 - C. Local level—1 point ea.
9. Attendance in relevant professional conferences (not to exceed 2*)
 - A. National level—2 points*
 - B. Regional level—1 point*

*Points for categories A and B as well as the maximum may be deducted if the faculty member pays over 50 percent of the expenses.)

COLLEGE SERVICE

1. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Member—5 points
2. Faculty Senate Membership—3 points
3. Faculty Senate Committee Chairmanship or Administrative Committee Chairmanship—4 points max.
4. Academic Policies Committee Membership—3 points
5. Personnel Committee Membership—3 points
6. Membership in any other Faculty Senate or Administrative Committee—2 points ea. (max. 4)
7. Extra Assignments to be Executed on a Regular Basis not Included Within Specified Committees—1 point max.

Community (6 points maximum)

1. Holding Positions or Responsibility in, or Special Recognition by non-profit Organizations—2 points max.
2. Service in an Elected Public Office—2 points max.
3. Service by Appointment to Public Office (Commission or Board)—2 points max.
4. Public Relations on Behalf of the College or Services Rendered to Community Groups, Youth or Adults—1 pt. max.
5. Presentations, Demonstrations, Lectures, Speeches, etc., in an Academic Area for Community Service—1 point (max. 3)

STEP SIX:

During the week of April 13-17 each faculty member meets with his department head. The department head completes the administrative evaluation (see form below), and uses the student evaluation sheets now made available to him, the activities assessment sheet, and the administrative evaluation to complete the individual faculty member's total evaluation. See the bottom half of the "contract" in Step Two.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPRAISAL

This section of the evaluation is subjective. The department head will use the behaviors listed below as guidelines in order to appraise the instructor. These statements describe behaviors in instruction, in student advising, and in attitudes.

Name _____
Score _____
24 Possible

Procedures: The value of +1 or 0 may be selected by the department head without evidence. The selection of -1 or lower by the department head must be evidenced by proof supplied by that department head. The burden of proof rests with the faculty member if values of +2 or +3 are to be awarded.

Responses—from page 5

our teaching materials to get an above average evaluation."

"Teaching materials, grading time requirements, and student assistance for problems demand many hours. Not all faculty members are given equal consideration for time and performance."

"The burden of proof should be on the administrator."

"Year after year, inefficient administrators continue to receive an across the board raise of a higher percentage than faculty. Why can't we receive a certain basic 70 and let merit pay be received for special service?"

QUESTION 5: Do you believe that the college service and professional part of the evaluation system is a valid measure/comparison of individual faculty contributions?

"Yes, but it penalizes certain segments of faculty—new and old—older faculty have to hustle to get on committees and officers of organizations rather than being allowed to gradually and gracefully relinquish duties and heavy loads."

"The college service points are biased towards service in the Senate or other administrative committees, biased against departmental committees. In particular, a new faculty member would find it difficult to get more than 3 or 4 points. Therefore, it is blatantly unfair. Similar comments to professional service part."

"Committees are just a pain to take up time and cause an up-roar. Who has time to write a book or who wants to for the credit received here?"

"It reduces everyone to a commonality. Those who really contribute to college committees cannot be distinguished from those who merely attend meetings. Those who really excel in scholarship cannot be distinguished from the dilettante."

"If this system must be used, then the faculty should be allowed to concentrate in one of the two rather than both. The faculty should not have to be all things at all times to all people."

"It is not open-ended enough to include areas for expertise in all disciplines. It is made to measure or account for specific areas within the Vice President's narrow expertise."

"Some faculty members are inherently limited by their disciplines in the ways they can contribute; so they are penalized by the current system."

"The administrative part of the evaluation is the straw that broke the camel's back. It was put together by lightweights who know very little about the complex art of teaching."

"Responsibilities accepted and performed by a faculty member as an incidental part of a 3 point sponsorship of an organization may be handed to a committee next year, with the committee chairman getting 2 points and each of the committee members getting one point each. In the sum of service, a faculty member may give service in depth in one type of activity, accumulating 21 service points, but because of exceeding maxima in certain categories, he may not be able to count the maximum service points in his evaluation."

"This part of the evaluation encourages faculty members to do a surface job on a lot of diverse activities and discourages cooperation and support among faculty members."

"A faculty member has little control over committee assignments, especially Faculty Senate and administrative."

"Yes, relatively so. Other substitutes would include a more performance based criteria for evaluating teaching. Do we want more of that?"

"The professional activities portion is fairer than some parts of the evaluation, though it is uneven in its application. It gives too much credit for some minor activities while denying credit for others. The college service can be grossly unfair to some teachers who have had no chance to establish connections. It is like faculty in that it (1) tends to cause a proliferation of committees and paper work as a way to earn extra points (2) makes a competition for a few high-point committee positions that tend to go to a select few under a buddy system (3) who are friends of the administration."

QUESTION 6: Do you believe that there is enough security with the administration of the student evaluation form?

"The present two-card system creates a greater chance for careless errors by the students. This would not be a concern if the process had been based on fairness and accuracy from the beginning."

"I know that there is at least one faculty member who administered the evaluation himself. This is unfair to those who follow the rules."

"This year there will be massive cheating on the results obtained by the student evaluation; hence, all evaluations obtained will be meaningless. Making any evaluation valid requires that a disinterested third party have complete control of the evaluation forms before and after the evaluation. The administration cannot be a disinterested third party."

"There are verifiable instances where security has been violated. This includes mistakes made in packaging the cards and having faculty numbers on cards. Having blank cards around campus is an invitation for these to be used wrongfully."

"Past abuses prove this. However, who knows whether the lights are left on in such a case as the system is."

QUESTION 7: Should student evaluation be used as part of merit pay determination?

"Not the student evaluation presently being used."

"Freshmen have no conception of high school vs. college teaching. They have been with peer group system of evaluation too long."

"This system is subject to too many random fluctuations."

"It should be used only for improvement of instruction."

"Yes, validity data shows a positive relationship between student ratings and how well students from different course sections do on a common final."

"Yes, but a smaller part than it currently plays."

"Our students have become quite sophisticated with evaluation. They get together, discuss a change they want and fill out the blanks a certain way."

"Administrators are paid to make decisions. Let them do it."

"This means I have to please students to get points. I doubt that this system maximizes their learning. Show me a job where the employees (at MSSC, the students) determine the wages of their supervisors."

"Only when validated by professionals can amateur judgments be tolerated in any fashion whatsoever."

"In the final analysis, I would have to indicate a weak 'yes.'"

"Yes, however, it should play a greatly decreased role."

"Another point brought out to me in the workshop. Most schools have gone away from merit completely."

QUESTION 8: What has been the effect of faculty evaluation on your morale?

"Unbelievably negative."

"It has the effect of dampening enthusiasm and creativity; teachers hesitate to try anything new. Also, it tends to weaken academic standards in the classroom. This is directly related to grade inflation."

"Wherever there is excessive pressure put on these evaluations like here at MSSC, it may force basically honest people to cheat. This defeats the whole purpose of the evaluation process."

"Neutral, this has been a more positive semester for me than other fall semesters comparatively."

"It does not make me feel I belong to a profession. It diminishes my role in education; it reminds me of grade school administration about 1950."

"I'm mad as hell! I have lost the equivalent of two weeks work just from discussing how bad this thing is. I have better things to do with my time."

"Faculty is expendable; students and administrators are not. The faculty stands alone. The administration and students dictate policy: how to teach, and any other things they can dream up, with no input by or recourse for faculty."

"I have used student evaluation forms each year since I have taught at MSSC and value them toward improvement of instruction. I don't feel they are sufficiently accurate to be used for merit pay and promotions."

QUESTION 9: Do you feel that the present evaluation system accurately ranks the faculty at MSSC?

"I am much playing going on to increase scores, i.e., if you can't give me a good evaluation, then don't show up."

"Students should definitely have input, but not dominate the system. The present system allows the tail to wag the dog. The fox has been put in charge of the chicken house."

"I believe more weight should be placed on professional performance: publications and participation in conferences."

"Ranking has no place in teaching evaluations. Take two teachers of equal ability; the administrator has to assign one a higher rank than the other."

"It does not give credit for many factors which are part of the job for one person's department but gives credit for things that are in many cases unimportant."

"We do not know what the size of the error of measurement is."

"It is grossly unfair to a number of faculty members. There are faculty who are overpaid by thousands of dollars in comparison with others. This differential tends to compound with the passing years as merit increases build up the salary base and this in turn becomes the springboard for excessive percentage increases."

"The present evaluation system encourages mediocrity until 'proof' is provided. No one, not even administrators, seem to know what is admissible as proof."

QUESTION 10: Do you believe that the present evaluation system should be used for purposes of determining raises and promotions for the 1981-82 school year?

"The welfare committee might ask someone from the evaluation committee to tell them what went into the system. It was carefully thought out!"

"It should be abolished immediately."

"Until a viable, comparative, or competitive system exists, I'd rather take my chances with the present system rather than the cult of personality 'good ole boy' approach."

"As bad as it was, the SIR was better than this. At least national surveys were available."

"We know that certain departments rank all individuals high to reflect their 'great' leadership. Some department heads are personal friends and dislikes to discriminate and bring faculty into line."

"The present system is only destructive and grossly unfair."

"I agree with the concept of evaluation. No evaluation system will please everyone. In the absence of a better system we go with what we have. I do not agree with the NEA 'ultimatum' nor the implication that NEA speaks for all the faculty."

"Yes, since we have no other system."

"This system should be considered an insult to the professional integrity of the MSSC instructional staff."

"Chuck the whole thing. Why put a bandaid on a mortal wound?"

Full text of committee report of 1979 reprinted for study

	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
	Always well-prepared for class; plans reflect syllabi; notes, materials, references always ready for immediate use.	Well-prepared 75% of time; plans reflect syllabi; notes, materials, references usually ready for immediate use.	Prepared majority of time; plans usually reflect syllabi; notes, materials, references ready for use majority of time.	Ill-prepared about half the time; notes, materials, references frequently not ready for immediate use.	Ill-prepared most of time; notes, materials, references almost never ready for immediate use.
2.		+1 Speech, language, and explanations almost always clear, concise, easy to understand.	0 Speech, language, and explanations usually clear, concise, easy to understand.	-1 Speech, language, and explanations frequently unclear, not concise, and/or difficult to understand.	
3.		+1 Establishes reasonable and challenging student objectives.	0 Student objectives reasonable.	-1 Student objectives unreasonable.	
4.	+3 Above average in all three.	+1 Above average in two of three.	0 Readily available for consultation with students; is familiar with current degree requirements, knows advisors and takes an active interest in each as an individual.	-1 Below average in two of three.	-3 Below average in all three.
5.		+1 Seeks out up-to-date content and methods to be integrated into course.	0 (Meets at least one of two criteria.)	-1 (Meets none of the criteria.)	
6.	+2 Develops and implements rigorous but achievable standards of performance in all courses; these standards are reflected in the final grades.	+1	0 Develops and implements rigorous but achievable standards in approximately half of the courses; these standards are reflected in the final grades.	-1	-2 Standards are not rigorous in any course or standards are not achievable; deficiencies reflected in final grades.
7.	+2 Overwhelming majority of items focus on major ideas and not on trivia; items are frequently upgraded on an objective basis.	+1 Overwhelming majority of items focus on major ideas and not on trivia; items are occasionally upgraded on an objective basis.	0 Overwhelming majority of items focus on major ideas and not on trivia; items infrequently upgraded.	-1 Majority of items focus on major ideas and not on trivia; items infrequently upgraded.	-2 Overwhelming majority of items focus on trivia; items infrequently upgraded.
8.	+2 Always returns graded assignments within one week.	+1 Usually returns graded assignments within one week.	0 Consistently returns graded assignments within two weeks.	-1 Usually requires more than two weeks to return graded assignments; always returns within four weeks.	-2 Fails to return one or more assignments during the semester or consistently requires more than four weeks.
9.	+2 Always uses scheduled class time constructively; meets class or consistently has an appropriate activity if unable to meet class.	+1 Usually uses scheduled class time constructively; meets class or usually has an appropriate activity if unable to meet class.	0 Generally uses scheduled class time constructively; meets class or has an appropriate activity at least half the time if unable to meet class.	-1 Frequently does not use scheduled class time constructively or has an appropriate activity occasionally if unable to meet class.	-2 Almost never uses scheduled class time constructively; meets class infrequently; activity absent or inappropriate if unable to meet class.
10.		+1 Shares knowledge of career opportunities, graduate school opportunities, and trends in employment and salary in the major field of study.	0 Shares knowledge of career opportunities and graduate school opportunities.	-1 Does not share knowledge of career opportunities or trends.	
11.	+2 Cooperates with other faculty; attends almost all department meetings; actively participates in departmental affairs.	+1 Cooperates with other faculty; (plus one more criterion.)	0 Cooperates with other faculty.	-1 (None of the criteria met.)	-2 Actively alienates others or actively discourages departmental affairs.
12.	+3 Accepts assignments and completes them satisfactorily; completes paper work on time; initiates ideas or programs to improve the quality of the department/school/college.	+1 (Meets at least two of the criteria.)	0 (Meets 1 criterion.)	-1 (None of the criteria met.)	-3 Actively avoids assignments or actively discourages ideas.
13.	+2 Always resolves problems at the lowest possible administrative level.	+1	0 Usually resolves problems at the lowest possible administrative level.	-1	-2 Never or usually resolves problems at the lowest administrative level.
14.		+1 Documentation that effort is being made to seek feedback for the improvement of instruction.	0 No effort.	-1 Actively avoids.	
15.		+1 Shows evidence of strong student rapport.	0 Generally shows evidence of student rapport.	-1 Little or no evidence of student rapport.	

STEP SEVEN:

The top 86 percent of the faculty in the evaluations will receive pay raises as follows: Of the monies available for pay raises, 80 percent of that amount will be distributed as percentage increases (across the board) and 20 percent will be used for merit increases. The amount of merit will be determined in the following way:

1. The faculty in Group 1 (those ranking in the upper 86 percent on evaluations) will be ranked from bottom to top upon the evaluation score. Each score will represent one step in the merit pay formula.
2. The sum of the number of each step multiplied by the number of people on that step equals the total number of merit units to be paid.
3. The amount of money available for merit divided by the number of merit pay units equals the amount of merit increase per step.
4. The amount per step multiplied by the number of the step equals the amount of merit pay for the faculty at that step.

Salary increases for faculty in the lowest 15 percent will be at the discretion of the President in discussion with the Budget committee. Some faculty may be placed in Group 1 to share in the merit increase. Some faculty may be accorded the percentage increase distributed to Group 1. Some may be paid less than the percentage increase.

In the fall of 1979 a faculty committee was formed to study the evaluation procedure. While most members of the committee were elected by the faculty in each of the college's divisions, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate appointed the chair and two other members. The committee worked through the fall semester, and in February, 1979, issued a lengthy report. The preface to that report is reprinted here:

IN ITS EXAMINATION of the present process of evaluation as presently used on this campus, the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluations has been most urgently impressed by the consequences of the system rather than by the techniques of the system. That faculty morale was low had been stated previously by other persons, but that statement alone was not taken as evidence that faculty members were, in fact, disenchanted with the process, felt threatened by it, or considered it unfair. Not far into this committee's study, however, it became clear, from verbal comments to committee members, from written comments on faculty surveys, and from results of faculty polling, that morale was lower than anyone might reasonably have imagined. What seems to be resulting from the current evaluation system, in fact, would appear to be precisely those consequences which should be avoided: Feelings of insecurity, lack of faith in the professionalism of administrators, lack of faith in the validity of the instruments used, a feeling that the system is unfair, a belief in the one-sidedness of the system, a belief that too many "exceptions" are made to the rules (thus a feeling of "favoritism"), a destruction of pride in their work as the part of many instructors, and a rather general belief that the system sets up student-teacher and teacher-administration adversary relationships. It would be easy to conclude quickly from these findings, therefore, that the entire evaluation system should be scrapped. It would be the easiest recommendation to make, and it would find acceptance with a large number of faculty members.

However, 86 percent of the faculty indicated they would support an evaluation system which they considered fair and with the principles of which they agree. Some 88 percent favor the general concept of merit raises, while nearly the same number disagree with the concept of merit raises as has been practiced on this campus. Some 60 percent indicated they favor student evaluations, but half were opposed to the Student Instruction Reports (the SIRs). And as we further surveyed the various aspects of the evaluation system, areas of dissatisfaction and specific causes of low morale became more and more obvious. To members of this committee it became clear, as discussion proceeded, that changes were needed and that unless changes were made, the College could well be inviting more serious morale problems for the future with unionization among the alternatives some faculty would suggest.

One of the first concerns of this committee, therefore, in considering the results of studies was the basic question: What is the purpose of evaluation on this campus? It is a question which should have been answered explicitly much earlier by those with authority to do so. Also of importance was the question: Who shall be evaluated? While we might recognize that evaluation or performance appraisal in some form or another will always take place, that employees will be subjected to ratings by their superiors, and that special salary considerations are likely to be given to employees who perform in especially meritorious ways, we found it difficult, at the outset, to accept what appeared to be a lack of direction compounded by the one-sidedness of the present system. In its actions last Spring, the Faculty Senate tied promotion to the establishment of a new evaluation system. That action was supported by the full faculty, and although changes were made in the policy as it left the Senate, the general concept was passed. That policy, at this writing, is still awaiting approval by the Board of Regents, but it appears likely that any promotion policy and any tenure policy approved will tie these advancements to an evaluation policy of some sort. We, however, were perplexed as to why all persons on the professional staff were not treated equally in regards to evaluation. We believe it necessary, as do a great many experts, that for any evaluation system which is used to include all professional employees of the institution and that all must be subjected to the same basic system with the same basic results. Simply, if faculty members are to be evaluated by students and department heads, then department heads must be evaluated by their faculty members and by their deans; and deans must be evaluated by their faculty members, their department heads and by their superiors. In other words, when one group is evaluated by those below it and by those above it in the professional scale, then all groups must be evaluated and the evaluations must be used for the same purposes in the same manner. Evaluation, if it is to exist, must exist for all, and it must be applied equally and evenly to all. This, we believe, is the essence of fairness. Moreover, it is the essence of professionalism. But this does not answer the question of purpose. If evaluation was intended originally to separate the so-called good teacher from the poor, perhaps it has, in some way or another. But what has happened to those rated unsatisfactory? Has assistance been offered these persons to help them improve?

Have they been removed from their positions? Or have they merely been penalized by receiving lower pay raises? Has any professional attempt been made to tell these persons why they have been rated unsatisfactory and what they must do, must do, or should do, to improve? If, on the other hand, the evaluation system was originally intended to honor the good, rather than to penalize the poor, how precisely have they been honored? It is urgent that these questions be answered.

IT WOULD APPEAR that the primary results of the evaluation system have been so-called merit increases for those rated in superior categories. While seemingly no one would object to the college's honoring such persons, there is great dissatisfaction in this area. Objections have been voiced to those receiving merit increases which become part of their base pay. Thus, these persons argue, a superior teacher one year is forever rewarded for that one superior year. Too, dissatisfaction exists because of the basic belief that in these days of inflationary spiral and increasing cost of living expenses, that the principal concern of the college administration should be to provide, to the best of its ability, cost of living or across-the-board increases which approximate the inflationary spiral. To do otherwise, the argument goes, is to further penalize the satisfactory teacher who, with only a slight increase, falls further behind in keeping up with expenses. Thus it would appear that it become necessary for all to recognize the desires of many faculty members that the college first provide cost of living increases and that, monies permitting, rewards of recognition be given to the superior faculty members as a time, and one time only, bonus.

Furthermore, because of the need to consider who shall be evaluated, it becomes clear that no one system of evaluation can be said to be fair. There are part-time faculty members as well as full-time faculty members, and these part-time members probably have additional duties. There must be several systems, devised specifically for types of personnel who have been employed for specific jobs. There must be several systems established within the same context of goals and purposes, and all systems must be handled fairly, evenhandedly, and professionally.

Possibly there could be a question of legality raised as to any merit performance evaluation used solely for salary determination. Such a question has been raised at other colleges with injunctions sought or issued against some universities and university systems. In some cases, faculty members have boycotted evaluation systems to test the legality of them when tied in with merit pay. Most usually the question is tied in with union representation. However, this is not always the case. In some instances, faculty members on our own campus have refused to take part in the evaluation system. These instances, admittedly, have been few and they have varied from total refusal to partial refusal. For example, some have refused to participate in the college service appraisal portion of the evaluation system. There are obvious precedents for saying, therefore, that the evaluation system has not been handled fairly in this respect and that the administration has not taken a firm stance on the matter. But we continue with the question of legality, at least some research [J.R. Kiernan, "Student Evaluations Re-Evaluated," *Community and Junior College Journal*, 45, 1975, 25-27] has pointed out that student evaluations of faculty are "tests" as defined by the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission Guidelines in regard to appointment, retention, and promotion of faculty members. The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare states that all tests used in relation to faculty must first be validated. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the college to define what the test is intended to measure and to assure that the test validly measures it. If a college fails in these tasks, it would appear to some writers and researchers that the use of student evaluations, particularly for administrative purposes, may be illegal. Only pending court cases may have the answer. One would wonder whether adequate research was done on the question of legality prior to the installation of the present system and its heavy reliance on SIRs. In any pending judicial resolution of the matter, we can do no more than to quote existing federal regulations:

"... in many instances persons are using tests as the basis for employment decisions without evidence that they are valid predictors of employee job performance."

"... For the purpose of the guidelines in this part, the term 'test' is defined as any paper-and-pencil or performance measure used as a basis for any employment decision. The term 'test' includes all formal, scored, quantified or standardized techniques of assessing job suitability."

In regards to validity the regulations state that "evidence of a test's validity should consist of empirical data demonstrating that the test is predictive of or significantly correlated with important elements of work behavior which comprise or are relevant to the job or jobs for which the candidates are being evaluated."

IT CAN, PERHAPS, be argued that the SIRs are, under definition of these regulations valid. However, the question remains as to whether the SIRs are valid

Text of 1979 committee report continues from preceding page

in all uses to which they are put in evaluating faculty members.

If we are to have evaluations, then this committee feels that those in positions of responsibility should want evaluation to reflect equitably and fairly on each and every person. Again, unless some professional steps are taken to help unsatisfactory faculty members, the system may be questioned as having a legitimate purpose. Conformity forced upon faculty members through such devices as the SIRs are as much to be feared as any pressures placed on faculty members from outside. In either event, academic freedom becomes a shadow of its former self. Perhaps part of the answer lies in the wording of future contracts which would state that if a faculty member receives unsatisfactory evaluations under a detailed and outlined program then he may be terminated, and that he forfeits his right as a tenured faculty member. Under such a system, however, it is mandatory that department heads be evaluated on their roles with these unsatisfactory persons. If the department head has not done everything possible in taking specific, concrete steps to aid, not merely to advise, unsatisfactory members, then he, too, must be penalized. While no system of improvement should be mandatory until after two years of unsatisfactory ratings, the college must make every effort to see that one of the primary purposes of evaluation is, indeed, the improvement of teaching and that evaluation be used only secondarily for other purposes.

Perhaps we come to another basic question. If the hiring process used is proper, if the procedures followed are professional, if federal and state guidelines are adhered to, and if final judgement on who shall be employed is based on who is best qualified to fill the position, then it must be assumed that talented, capable, competent professionals are employed. In such a case, all that is needed, it would appear, is a periodic review of a faculty member's performance in his assigned task with special attention paid to any highly significant accomplishment which might be termed meritorious. Otherwise, it can be assumed that administrators who are responsible for hiring are failing in their jobs by failing to check references or other credentials. Particularly this should be true if a large number of unsatisfactory faculty members appears in any one department or division.

Here then we come to another nagging concern—the great amount of dissatisfaction expressed by faculty members with administrators. There were strong and repeated suggestions received by this committee that administrators be paid to administer and therefore must administer. If they cannot, they should be removed or they should be schooled. Probably the most repeated comment made was that department heads should undergo training in the evaluation of teaching performance and in the aiding of those persons falling short of their expectations. We strongly suggest, therefore, that short courses or seminars be held for one or two week periods each summer for department heads in evaluation and administrative procedures.

We were concerned also with a multitude of other problems. For example, we were concerned with younger faculty members versus older faculty members in terms of competition for committee assignments or elected positions. We were concerned, along these lines, with recognition for past service. There can be no doubt in our minds that some faculty members, after a number of years of quality service to the teaching profession, have reached a point where they could properly be classified as "master teachers." They have demonstrated their classroom abilities repeatedly. Their former students speak highly of them. These teachers have sponsored organizations in the past, have served on the Faculty Senate and on committees, have developed syllabi and course outlines, have developed, proposed, and revised course offerings. Now, in some cases, they have chosen, or would choose, to limit their major energies and efforts to what they have spent a lifetime in developing—their marked abilities in the classroom. We do not advocate a form of "campus retirement." Rather we would ask a recognition of past performance and a recognition of personal competency.

We have considered the other end of the spectrum as well—the brand new faculty member in his first year of teaching. How discouraging it can become for such a person who receives little or no guidance in his first classroom experiences. Students, generally, find it easier to identify with younger faculty members, we find, but they may not always recognize the difference in techniques employed by younger and older faculty members. So young faculty members often receive inflated student ratings, giving them a false sense of their own abilities. Couple this, however, with their selection to sponsor student organizations, their energies permitting them to serve on committees and special assignments, and one sees the possibility of ratings which may be unreasonably high compared with older faculty members. These ratings go a long way towards establishing one's competency, but in some cases it may be a competency rating undeserved. Therefore, we would recommend that department heads and division deans guide and counsel faculty members during their first three years of teaching experience, observe them more frequently in the classroom, and during their first year, particularly, take into consideration the difficulty or impossibility they have in serving on elected committees.

HEREIN, WE REACH another question which may cause the present evaluation system to be challenged on legal grounds. There is some concern expressed that the system may be in violation of equal opportunity laws inasmuch as the few members of positions open on campus committees may make the gaining of points under the present system unfair. No court cases have been settled in any matter such as this to the present date, but examination of the laws which state that each person must have equal opportunity to gain merit factors toward promotion or for other consideration would tend to question this aspect of the system. There would appear to be possible grounds for discrimination in this respect to both age and sex. There are, for example, three men to every woman on this faculty. Only three women are presently serving on the 33-member Faculty Senate. The ratio of women to men on other committees also appears to be somewhat disproportionate.

In any event, as to the new faculty member, while these persons may take highly in professional service and in teaching duties, they will probably be lower in college service under the present evaluation system. Thus, they too, will suffer. Obviously, fairness should involve equal chances for all persons to gain maximum recognition. The entire area would need further examination in a new evaluation system.

In addition, we were concerned with those persons in the fine arts areas whose professional services may be revealed less in publications and in state and national meetings and more in their production of works, in exhibits, and in performances. They must not be penalized by a system which fails to recognize the hours they spend in contact with students outside the formal classroom structure in demonstrations, in rehearsals, or in merely working to improve themselves. Here we cannot limit ourselves to members of the fine arts departments, however; we must also include those persons in other activities peculiar to their own disciplines or professions. We are beginning to recognize that the doctorate is not the usual degree goal in all disciplines; we must also recognize that fulfillment of their responsibilities to students go beyond those areas which have been measured by the present evaluation system. We do not begin to see the possibility or desirability of publications. We recommend, however, that the Faculty Service Report be made an integral part of a new evaluation system and that credit for contact hours outside the classroom be given.

WE WERE EQUALLY CONCERNED with what appeared to be broad disparities between general education courses and those in major areas. We find, generally speaking, that instructors

of general education courses rate lower in those classes than in their other classes, that those persons who teach only non-required courses or courses only in major fields have fared far better. The morale factor becomes especially crucial here. These aspects were discussed in the report on the SIR. At this point, however, we find that there appears to be enough of a disparity to warrant special analysis of what constitutes true teaching ability. We would recommend, therefore, that in any evaluation system which might be adopted finally by the college that the burden placed on teachers of required general education courses be given special consideration. Appropriate remedies must be taken, we believe, or the decline in morale will become precipitous and will probably be a leading cause in any movement to establish a collective bargaining on this campus.

While the SIR is discussed in a separate section of this report, we do want to state now that unless substantial changes are made in its handling if it is kept in the future, severe problems will result. While our final recommendation does not recommend the continued use of the SIR, we realize that at some future date it may be reinstated. We want to emphasize, however, that the SIR's primary use should be for the improvement of instruction and not for the rating of faculty members.

We were chagrined to find inconsistencies across campus as to what professional organizations count in some

departments but not in others (MSTA and NEA, for example), what activities could be claimed (without proof of actual participation) by some faculty members, and how rather simple instructions for figuring points or participation could be interpreted differently by different departments. So ridiculous were these inconsistencies, so rigid their application in some departments, so loose in others, that we would be seriously concerned about the validity of past evaluations for the majority of the faculty. We would recommend, therefore, that in any modification of the present system specific guidelines and specific parameters be established.

IN GENERAL, while the current system was undoubtedly devised after considerable study and while there are elements within which could perhaps be part of a valid, useful system for improvement of teaching, it would appear that the chief question which can be raised about the system is the professionalism with which it has been handled. The professionalism would appear to be chiefly a matter of consistency, consistency across campus in what may be counted, what may not be, consistency in the use of it from one year to the next, consistency in the procedures used to administer it, consistency in the scoring techniques used on the SIR from one year to the next, consistency in who is evaluated and who is not, and even consistency in what is said by some administrators or what is done. Many persons commented, "There is little hope that the present system will be administered professionally." And with that, we must agree.

While there is some satisfaction in some areas with the system, there is far greater dissatisfaction in other areas. And the areas where satisfaction can be identified are those where no general education courses are taught, where leadership is strongest, and where the faculty have received the greatest financial rewards because of a system which operates in their favor.

Finally, in a re-emphasis of a previous statement, this committee feels strongly as do a vast majority of this faculty that, in these days of double-digit inflation and spiraling price increases, it is unwise and unrealistic not to give serious consideration to the concept of general across-the-board increases with merit pay bonuses being reserved for those who are indeed meritorious. But the word bonuses becomes crucial in the proper understanding of this concept, for it is generally felt that meritorious service should be honored by a one-time payment and that it not become part of the base salary of a faculty member. We are (not) ignoring past arguments in favor of merit increases. We are stating simply that in 1979 with the economic picture of the nation as it is that the past systems of granting merit increases are themselves without merit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- We recommend:
1. That the Faculty Service Report be made an integral part of a new evaluation system and that credit for contact hours outside the classroom be given.
 2. That specific guidelines and parameters be agreed upon by department heads as to what organizations, what activities, and what assignments may count in the present activities assessment.
 3. That a new process of review and appeals be established.
 4. That the use of the SIR be discontinued.
 5. That across-the-board pay raises shall apply when the monies available do not exceed the current rate of inflation.
 6. That within the first two weeks of the academic year, each member of the teaching faculty shall be informed of the program and procedures of evaluation to be used during the current year. Providing this information shall be the responsibility of the President of the College who may delegate this task to division deans or the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
 7. That prior to October 16, teaching faculty members new to the College shall meet with the division deans for a briefing conference at which time faculty members may ask questions or receive aid as they desire. The conference shall cover these points: Evaluation procedures, procedures and practices which the teachers have found to be unusually successful and rewarding, questions the teachers may have about routines and regulations, problems the teachers may have, and ways in which their special talents may aid the department, the division, and the College.
 8. That twice each year each probationary faculty member shall be evaluated. Every non-probationary teacher shall be evaluated every third year in each semester of that year. However, a department head or a teacher may call for an evaluation in any year. Announcement of those faculty members to be evaluated during the year, however, shall be made within the first two weeks of the school year. However, a tenured faculty member receiving an unsatisfactory rating one year shall be evaluated during the following two years. Improvement must be shown, or a terminal contract may be issued.

First NEA protest action

The first in a series of protest actions by the campus NEA group was the distribution of leaflets such as the one below. Distributed on campus and in town last week, the leaflets ask persons to contact members of the Board of Regents.

YOUR COLLEGE NEEDS

A CRISIS HAS DEVELOPED AT MSSC. THE CURRENT EVALUATION CREATED THE CRISIS. IT FORCES THE STUDENTS TO EVALUATE THE FACULTY, WHICH IN TURN DETERMINES THE SALARY WHICH FACULTY MEMBERS RECEIVE. THIS IS AN ADMINISTRATIVE JOB THAT SHOULD NOT BE DELEGATED TO STUDENTS. WE NEED YOUR HELP TO GET THIS SYSTEM STOPPED AND INSTEAD LET THE PROFESSORS CONCENTRATE ON EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING.

YOUR

IF YOU FEEL AS WE DO, CALL ONE OF YOUR REGENTS AND TELL HIM TO DROP THIS EVALUATION SYSTEM:

IN JOPLIN: WILLIAM SCHWAB, FERRIMENT 623-8865	FRED HUGHES 623-1633	JERRY WELLS 623-7752	GLENN WILSON 623-5392
IN DARTMOUTH: RAY GRACE 358-4669	IN SARCOXIE: LOREN OLSON 548-2710		

HELP

PLEASE DO NOT LITTER

DISTRIBUTED BY MSSC-NEA



35 schools compete in speech tournament

Thirty-five high schools from Missouri, Oklahoma, and Arkansas participated in last weekend's 10th Annual Forensic Tournament on the Southern campus. Okmulgee (Okla.) High School took sweepstakes honors with 167 points. Jenks (Okla.) High School was second with 133 points, and Booker T. Washington High School of Tulsa was third with 82 points. Nevada High School took fourth place with 69 points.

In the team events, Okmulgee placed in seven, taking first in humorous interpretation, first and third in dramatic interpretation, second in extemporaneous speaking, second and third in poetry, first in humorous duet, second in dramatic duet, and first in championship debate.

The total team points are referred to as sweepstakes, or the points amassed by all students who placed in quarter finals of debate. In debate, those qualifying for the quarter finals win 15 points for their team. In individual competition, two points are awarded to those who qualify for semi-finals. Fifteen points are received for a first place finish, ten points for a second, and five points for a third.

According to tournament director Dick Finton, much work is put into each event with debaters working two or three hours a day from school's beginning to the first of October and the beginning of practice rounds. It then takes from seven to 12 hours of participation in a tournament, depending on the number of rounds.

Debaters receive one topic that is used nationwide for the entire year. This year's topic for high school participants was "Consumer Product Safety."

Individual competitors work from two to three hours a day for four to five weeks in preparation. They then work for at least an hour a day before a tournament "to get things just right," Finton said. Tournament competition then takes about two hours before knowing the semi-finalists and the finalists.

Work in preparing for the tournament organization took about 600 man hours, according to Finton. Working with the judges took an additional 76 man hours. Judges were from the Kiwanis Club, local business people, faculty members, and students, all of whom volunteered their services.

The 500 hours of work was done by about 10 people, Finton said. Their efforts were paid by finding new talent to build a stronger Southern debate team. Finton added that through the tournament Southern saw eight talented students they would not have seen otherwise.

He continued by saying that the tournament was "good for publicity and recruiting." He added that this tournament was the "largest and best we've had. The kids were terribly cooperative." He also gave much praise to the speech faculty who "worked so hard" to make the tournament a success.



The team of Wheat and Freihofer perform their interpretation of Shakespeare's "A Mid Summer Night's Dream" in the Humorous Duet Acting Division of Missouri Southern's 10th Annual Speech and Debate Tournament. The duet from Okmulgee High School placed first in that competition.



The Arts



As the house lights illuminate the auditorium and the audience departs, the **cast** of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern **are** in the wings for the word of yet another **act** of the production. Within the next week the American College Theatre Festival will be deciding on the play finalists for presentation at the festival during this coming semester. According to director Duane L. Hunt, the production has an excellent chance of obtaining a position at the festival. Below is Dan Weaver with his portrayal of Guildenstern. To the left are the Tragedians, Chester Lien, Terry Cole, J.P. Dickey, Jim Blair, and the Player, Michael Apfel.



'Stardust Memories' Allen's best film

By J. Todd Belk

When critical and commercial approval is blessed upon an artist, much of the artist's reaction is spent trying to undo what could be a shortcoming in creativity. Who better transform this feeling into film than Woody Allen? He has in *Stardust Memories*.

Much of the feeling of the whole movie is summed up in the first five minutes of the film. Woody is inside a passenger car of a train. As the camera pans the environment, he begins to notice that he is surrounded by undesirable characters. Then another passenger car is noticed parallel with the one we're in. There's a difference: the fact that the other car is filled with a group of desirable characters. They smile at Allen and begin to toy with him. Allen can't escape his car to reach the other one. The train begins to move,

and he finally reaches its destination, a dump.

The preceding was part of a movie the character, filmmaker Sandy Bates, played by Woody Allen, just finished. The only problem is it's a serious movie and he's a comedian. The story parallels with Allen's own experiences. The producers are screaming, and so is Sandy Bates.

Like Allen's drama, *Interiors*, *Stardust Memories* is clouded by an aura of doom. The only relief is that throughout the film, excerpts from the film *Sandy Bates* has made appear. It is so off-the-wall, he would laugh, if one can follow it.

ALREADY SHOT DOWN by the critics and ignored by the general public, this can be considered Woody Allen's most ambitious film. Though I would probably be stoned to death for saying it, I

would have to consider *Stardust Memories* his best feature yet.

Throughout the major part of the film, filmmaker Sandy Bates is showing his film at a seminar at a resort hotel to students, critics, and townspeople. He's terrified by the possibility of those involved. To add depth to his insight, Allen has one of the most unusual groups of people assembled. All those aunts and uncles you would want to see again.

As in all Allen films, Sandy Bates has problems of the opposite sex. One of one as in *Annie Hall*, it developed into three, Charlotte Rampling, Jessica Harper, and Marie Christine Barrault. Each female carries her own problem which keeps Sandy jumping from one to another.

RELATIONSHIPS with the

could be the key to Sandy Bates' problem. Throughout the film, Bates has a problem with being content with himself. To better this problem, the film cuts back and forth in periods of time, and in and out of his mind.

To give *Stardust Memories* texture in New Jersey setting in which it was filmed, it was filmed in black and white. Already an expert in this with *Interiors* and *Manhattan*, Gordon Willis gives his best yet, with amazingly sharp contrasts between black and white.

By the end of the film, one finally played everyone at the seminar. It abruptly ends with everyone walking out of the hall, commenting on each other's performance. As the credits unroll, you wonder whether you have been ripped off or not. You have to look upon Bates' lack of satisfaction and his urge to make a serious film in an absurd world.

'Passion' next film in series

The Missouri Southern Film Society with the aid of the Missouri Arts Council and National Endowment for the Arts will present the sixth program in the current film festival at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, Jan. 27, in the top floor rotunda of the Billingsly Student Center. The epic 1919 silent film, *Passion* will be shown.

Passion, also known as *Madame Dubarry*, is a famous historical spectacular whose great success in America and the rest of the world did much to encourage the further production of costume dramas. The private life of Louis XV's mistress, her affair with a courtier, the passion that sparked the French Revolution and her death by guillotine. The film highlighted for the first time the human side of its historical characters making history largely a matter of human emotions.

Directed by Ernst Lubitsch, Germany's huge UFA studios, *Passion* is still considered to be the best about the 18th century courtesan, Madame Dubarry. In his reference work *Dictionary of Films* Georges Sadoul mentioned, "The film's brilliant match by the handling of the crowd scenes notably in the guillotine with the raised fists of the rebels demanding the death of the King's favorite. However, the rebels are caricatured; this undoubtedly contributed to the film's success."

Admission is \$1.50 for adults and \$1.00 for students or citizens, or by season ticket.

Blondie forges ahead to new ideals for the future

By J. Todd Belk

After an artist has reached a level of popularity, at least among the original peers, what direction do they go? Bridging the expanding different audiences is one answer. On the current release from Automerican from the recording artists Blondie, new ideals are enacted to forge toward the future.

This is most evident on the opening number "Europa." Composed by guitarist Chris Stein, the band transforms from rock 'n roll roots, to an orchestration. With a strong emphasis on strings, performed by Jimmy Hasell, the creation lends itself a soundtrack similar to the compositions in *Midnight Express*.

BLONDIE SEEMS to be trapped bet-

ween two worlds. Sort of the link between a generation gap. If adequately promotes themselves it could promote. Throughout the album the band pleads for acceptance in three different, yet literally the same songs. On one side, Blondie camps to the older generation on the classic Lerner and Lowe tune "Follow Me" while the tracks they develop their rock 'n roll style with Jimmy Destri's "Walk Like Me."

Perhaps both worlds on the band's current single "The Tide Is High." Written by Duke Reid, the song is underplayed with soft reggae beat. Still the same message at Deborah Harry's.

The tide is high, but I'm holdin' on
I'm going to be your number one
I'm not the kind of girl
who gives up just like that, oh no!

It's the things you
that and hurt bad.
But it's the way you do the things to me

IT'S JUST ALL THOSE people who exclaimed, "How she sing, she can't even comb her hair." You might have said you didn't like Blondie because you didn't like rock 'n roll, but not anymore. The prejudice may remain in the band's looks but not in the style of music.

Three different numbers, the voice of Deborah Harry is focused upon "Here's Looking At You," "Follow Me," and "Faces" display Harry's ability to tackle torch, jazz, and big band music. All these songs display Deborah Harry's outstanding

On the song "Voices," written by

Deborah Harry, the band dropped. Instead, a jazz combo is substituted, consisting of Steve Goldstein on piano, Ray Brown on bass, and Tom Scott on the sax. The result could be the beginning of a gradual break away from the rock 'n roll.

Still, the familiar Blondie is evident on other songs. Deborah Harry's low-ranged voice and Jimmy Destri's versatile keyboard playing help evoke Lou Reed's David Bowie on "Angel's On the Balcony." On "Do the Dark," the band continues to penetrate the dance scene. With the addition of a lyricist, the band is given a milder flavor. Heavy bass lines and drum rolls from Nigel Harrison and Clem Burke, respectively, add dimension to "Walk Like Me." And to keep progressing with the avant garde scene, a Talking Heads-style funk is adopted on "Rapture."

'The Elephant Man' is okay, but the play is better

By J. Todd Belk

With sensationalism as a favorite obsession with the American public, as well as a profitable for the news media, what would be an appropriate film for the times than *The Elephant Man*?

For those unfamiliar with the story of the Elephant Man, he was an individual who was grossly deformed from birth. From the moral viewpoint at the time, the Victorian Era, he was considered nothing more than a curiosity to be observed in tent shows. What makes this story a headliner is the intervention of a doctor who presented the Elephant Man to London society as a human being, not just a curiosity.

It's a giant idea, but when it comes to the final observation of the film, it seems helplessly lost between ideas. Throughout the film, it appears there is a struggle to be a symbolic

realistic film without trying to merge the two.

THE PHOTOGRAPHY wants you to believe there are countless possibilities for the Elephant Man's problems. They range from the industrial revolution to the poor man's mother. Much of this style of photography is traced back to the surrealistic New Wave films, but it does quite work.

On the other hand, the screenplay wants to pack in every ounce of sentiment. This is obviously achieved that the film passed off for melodrama. Plus, what is being observed in the photography is never quite justified in the script. It's just left to the viewer.

Just because the script and the photography have a habit to appear pointless, doesn't mean there aren't outstanding qualities in the film.

ACTING QUALITIES throughout the film are professionally adequate. Most noteworthy is Anthony Hopkins as Frederick Trèves, the doctor with the heart of gold who protects the Elephant Man; Ann Bancroft as Madge Kendall, stage actress who first takes up with the Elephant Man; John Gielgud as Carr Gomm, the hospital supervisor who develops an open mind from his experience; and Freddie Jones as Bytes, the showman who owned the Elephant Man and would go out of his way to brutalize him.

This leaves the performance of the Elephant Man, known by the name John Merrick. John Hurt, previously in *Midnight Express* and *Alien*, role. Throughout the film, Hurt gives the right amount of insight to the troubled tumbler. Most of the part, though, is underplayed, leaving the audience to react. Christopher Tucker must be applauded for his make-up on Hurt, which

kept the John Hurt in the dark and brought out from research what the Elephant Man looked like.

David Lynch given this assignment from producer Mel Brooks, after he proved to be an outstanding talent with his debut *Eraserhead*. It is a horror film a few years which is still playing the midnight show in urban areas. With *The Elephant Man*, perhaps much more stake. To jump from a cheaply made, low budgeted company film is a hard task. He still shows potential, but he's still sorting out ideas.

Besides these drawbacks, more problems arise. Already on the stage is a Broadway version of the story. The play had already been a critical financial success. If people are going to be entertained, it will probably be with the play version. Not that the play is better, but it has already been established, and people love to stick with traditional concepts.

Women's show at Artworks

Paintings, drawings, and original prints by four women are on exhibit at the Artworks, Inc. Gallery, 316 Joplin. The exhibit is on display 1-4 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays and beginning Dec. 22, daily. The show ends Dec. 28.

Judith Noble Fowler, drawing and printmaking instructor at Southern, showing color etchings and figurative drawings and watercolor paintings. Kathy Wilson DeTar is exhibiting paintings concentrating on figures and interior scenes. Sara Jacobs Perkins is showing oil painting in an "interiors" series. Pat Provenzano is showing paintings, drawings and prints.

The recent work by the four women occupies the main gallery. In smaller exhibition Christmas arts and crafts from the membership of the 20-artist cooperative are on display.

Echoes of the 1950s and 1960s in Rockpile's music



With echoes of the fifties and early sixties reflecting in the current pop music scene, when would be a more poignant time for the emergence of the rock 'n' roll quartet known as Rockpile? The answer is now, as their first album together, *Seconds of Pleasure*, was discovered buried in a crate with a date line, 1960.

To a few American souls by their 1960s careers, Nick Lowe, bassist-vocalist, and Dave Edmunds, guitarist-vocalist, made up the front portion of the group. Billy Bremner, guitarist-vocalist, and Terry Williams, drummer, rounded out the band.

BETTER KNOWN in England, a portfolio of accomplishments by Lowe and Edmunds will enlighten fans in the dark.

Nick Lowe in the past few years has been considered the top producer in the English rock scene. He started out in the late sixties producing the *Swamp* of his pub band, Brinsley Schwarz. Then Lowe produced four albums for Elvis Costello, two for the Damned, and one album for the Damned. Last year Nick Lowe produced the Spectresque single "Stop Your Sobbing" for the *Swamp*. In the past year Lowe produced Carlene Carter's (his wife) *Musical Shapes* as well as producing a single for Johnny Cash, Carlene's stepfather.

Columbia Records picked up on Nick Lowe in 1977 when he produced his first solo album *Pure Pop for Now People*. Next year Lowe scored a dent in the American charts when his *Labour of Lust* featured a Top 10 single "Cruel Be Kind."

DAVE EDMUNDS, like Lowe, has been around since the 1960s. His first success was a guitarist with a British group called Love Sculpture in 1970. Edmunds released a hot single "I Hear You Knocking" which eventually made the American charts. His 1974 album *Subtle as a Flying Mallet*, which was produced by Lowe, was released in 1975. Over the past few years he has produced a number of albums, *Hot Wax Tracks* and *Repeat When Necessary*.

Describing the Rockpile album as a journey into the earlier sound, you can tune into the sounds of the Everly Brothers, Righteous Brothers, and Chuck Berry, you're in the right direction. Those are a few of the models in which the Rockpile sound.

It would be easy to pass them off, just by saying it's pop music and pop singers are a dime a dozen. Nick Lowe has a writing skill, though. He's not just rehashing old classics; he's writing new songs. As in the song "Heart,"

Heart, don't do it, if it's not the thing
Heart, I get so easily deceived
Heart, there's no other I can turn to
If you, then who can I believe?

THROUGHOUT THE ALBUM, Lowe, Edmunds and the other two take their turn with the microphone. Lowe and Edmunds usually take the sweet sentimental songs, while Edmunds takes the rock-a-billy movers.

tube time

a guide to television viewing on cable tv
furnished by cablecom of michigan

Home Box Office Highlights

"Mad"

"French Postcards"

"High Society"

"Going in Style"

Big Bad Mama

Lost and Found

Hero at Large

Diamonds Are Forever

Snow White

daytime

Time	Channel	Program	Time	Channel	Program
6:00 a.m.	2	International Byline	12:00	12	One Life to Live
6:30	4	Cosmo Day	1:00	9	Green Acres
7:00	5	Good Morning America	1:30	12	Green Acres
7:30	6	700 Club	2:00	12	Green Acres
8:00	7	CBS Morning News	2:30	12	Green Acres
8:30	13	The Today Show	3:00	12	Green Acres
9:00	13	The Today Show	3:30	12	Green Acres
9:30	13	The Today Show	4:00	12	Green Acres
10:00	13	The Today Show	4:30	12	Green Acres
10:30	13	The Today Show	5:00	12	Green Acres
11:00	13	The Today Show	5:30	12	Green Acres
11:30	13	The Today Show	6:00	12	Green Acres

thursday

Time	Channel	Program	Time	Channel	Program
6:00 a.m.	2	HBO Sports	12:00	12	One Life to Live
6:30	4	Cosmo Day	1:00	9	Green Acres
7:00	5	Good Morning America	1:30	12	Green Acres
7:30	6	700 Club	2:00	12	Green Acres
8:00	7	CBS Morning News	2:30	12	Green Acres
8:30	13	The Today Show	3:00	12	Green Acres
9:00	13	The Today Show	3:30	12	Green Acres
9:30	13	The Today Show	4:00	12	Green Acres
10:00	13	The Today Show	4:30	12	Green Acres
10:30	13	The Today Show	5:00	12	Green Acres
11:00	13	The Today Show	5:30	12	Green Acres
11:30	13	The Today Show	6:00	12	Green Acres

friday

Time	Channel	Program	Time	Channel	Program
6:00 a.m.	2	HBO Sports	12:00	12	One Life to Live
6:30	4	Cosmo Day	1:00	9	Green Acres
7:00	5	Good Morning America	1:30	12	Green Acres
7:30	6	700 Club	2:00	12	Green Acres
8:00	7	CBS Morning News	2:30	12	Green Acres
8:30	13	The Today Show	3:00	12	Green Acres
9:00	13	The Today Show	3:30	12	Green Acres
9:30	13	The Today Show	4:00	12	Green Acres
10:00	13	The Today Show	4:30	12	Green Acres
10:30	13	The Today Show	5:00	12	Green Acres
11:00	13	The Today Show	5:30	12	Green Acres
11:30	13	The Today Show	6:00	12	Green Acres

saturday

Time	Channel	Program	Time	Channel	Program
6:00 a.m.	2	HBO Sports	12:00	12	One Life to Live
6:30	4	Cosmo Day	1:00	9	Green Acres
7:00	5	Good Morning America	1:30	12	Green Acres
7:30	6	700 Club	2:00	12	Green Acres
8:00	7	CBS Morning News	2:30	12	Green Acres
8:30	13	The Today Show	3:00	12	Green Acres
9:00	13	The Today Show	3:30	12	Green Acres
9:30	13	The Today Show	4:00	12	Green Acres
10:00	13	The Today Show	4:30	12	Green Acres
10:30	13	The Today Show	5:00	12	Green Acres
11:00	13	The Today Show	5:30	12	Green Acres
11:30	13	The Today Show	6:00	12	Green Acres

Holiday Ball

Featuring Full Circle

TONIGHT

9 p.m.—1 a.m.

Connor Ball Room, Billingsly Student Center

Hors d'ourves

Punch

Santa Clause

Special Holiday Prizes

Coat and Hat Check Girls

Semi-Formal, Suit and Dress

First Time Ever
Union Party Decorations

LIVE BAND

Sponsored by the College Union Board

CUB from page 3

met little success. Carnahan was quick to add that "this does not mean that such projects would not be tried in the future." The gym on Sundays seems to be working out thus far, and the future completion of the new multi-purpose building will help create entertainment for students.

As of this time money for only the first phase of the building has been appropriated and the drawings are in the final stages. Dolence said they hope to have a bid by spring and a spring or early summer groundbreaking. The first phase of the building will include a swimming pool, basketball courts, dressing facilities, offices, and storage space. Phase two would include more offices, more dressing facilities, a weight room, jogging area, and an arena which will seat approximately 4,000 persons.

THE COMPLETED BUILDING would contain at least four practice areas and a larger seating capacity which could possibly mean larger-scale concerts and other such events. Money, however, for the completion of phase two has not been appropriated and the building is well into the future for present students.

The completion of the lounge area in residence hall II is another project being worked on the help alleviate the cramped recreation facilities of dormitory students. Finishing touches should be made soon with the addition of four couches, tables, an ice machine, color television, ping pong tables, and other equipment. The Residence Hall Association is planning a possible holiday dance in the new area. If nothing else, Dolence feels, the new area will provide a place where people can congregate.

Carnahan also feels that the newly formed R.H.A. will help in creating entertainment for Southern students. Aside from that he feels that a "steady diet of programming and an increase or change in publicity" will help students find things to do. Dolence also said that tradition plays a major role in how activities are accepted, example of this theory being the Homecoming cookout and the spring freebie week. He said, "First year things excite some interest, while it may take time for some things to 'catch on'."

Apathy may be blamed for a certain amount of participation, and apathy is definitely not unique to Southern. Blaming apathy will not change a situation. Taking action, however, can help to change things that need revision and support existing well-established programs.

sunday

6:00 a.m.	2 International Byline	4 Target	6 Public Affairs
6:30	2 Joan Fontaine	4 Hour of Deliverance	8 Public Forum
11 Bass Fishin' Am.			
7:00	2 Kennedy's Spotlight	3 Cosmos	4 Mass
11:20	5 Rex Humbard	6 Public Affairs	8 Baptist Hour
13 Bullwinde			
7:30	2 Paul Ryan	4 Jimmy Swaggart	6 Larry Jones
13 Unclesing			
8:00	2 Celebrity	3 Master Theatre	5 Revival Fires
11:20	5 Missionaries	6 Pivotal	8 Afterschool
13 Jimmy Swaggart			
8:30	3 Outdoor Okla	4 Patsy's Thru	5 Thy Kingdom Come
11:20	5 Sunday Morning	8 Gospel of Christ	13 Larry Jones
9:00	2 Cycle	3 King Edward	4 Wrestling
11:20	5 Jerry Falwell	8 Jerry Falwell	13 Bible Stories
13 PTL Network			
9:30	2 Wrestling	3 My Three Sons	4 Kenneth Copeland
11:20	5 Day of Discovery	8 Day of Discovery	13 Oral Roberts
10:00	3 Sneak Previews	4 Cisco Kid	5 Hour of Power
11:20	5 Robert Schuller	8 Bewitched	11 ESPN Sports
13 Oral Roberts			
10:30	2 Home Mechanic	3 Countdown	4 Sgt Preston
11:20	5 Call the Doctor	8 Face the Nation	10 PTL Network
13 Superstars			
11:00	2 Golf	3 NOVA	4 Lone Ranger
11:20	5 Forest Park Baptist	8 Baptist Church	10 Baptist Hour
13 Meet the Press			
11:30	2 Plant Groom	4 Garden State	5 NFL
11:20	5 NFL	8 NFL	13 NFL
noon	2 Chels Secrets	3 Washington Week	4 Issues & Answers
11:20	5 Festival of Praise	8 Directions	10 NFL Football
13 NFL			
12:30	3 Wall Street Week	5 Football	8 Up Front
11:20	5 Nickelodeon	8 Nickelodeon	10 PTL Network
9:00	2 Hot Stuff	3 Ben Hur	4 Lili (Miami)
11:20	5 Holiday on Ice	8 Holiday on Ice	13 PTL Network
9:30	2 PTL Network	3 Ladies' Man	4 Little Rascals
11:20	5 Christmas	8 Christmas	13 Christmas
10:00	3 Dick Cavett	4 News	5 News
11:20	5 Sports	8 Sports	13 News
10:30	2 HBO-Paris Cabaret	3 Music World	4 Starsky & Hutch
11:20	5 Nightline	8 Movie	13 CBS Movies
9:00	2 KTLN News	3 CBS News	4 CBS News
11:20	5 CBS News	8 CBS News	13 CBS News
6:00	2 MacNeil/Lehrer Report	3 News	4 Star Trek
11:20	5 News	8 News	13 News
6:30	2 HBO-Three Sports	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Beverly Hills	8 Beverly Hills	13 Beverly Hills
7:00	2 HBO-Greatest Story Ever Told	3 Great Performances	4 Joker's Wild
11:20	5 Emmett Otter	8 Emmett Otter	13 Emmett Otter

monday

6:00	2 MacNeil/Lehrer Report	3 News	4 Star Trek
11:20	5 News	8 News	13 News
6:30	2 HBO-Three Sports	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Beverly Hills	8 Beverly Hills	13 Beverly Hills
7:00	2 HBO-Greatest Story Ever Told	3 Great Performances	4 Joker's Wild
11:20	5 Emmett Otter	8 Emmett Otter	13 Emmett Otter
6:00	2 Football	3 Hocus Focus	4 Fox
11:20	5 Bears	8 Bears	13 Bears
7:30	2 Play Percentages	3 PTL Network	4 Ladies' Man
11:20	5 Little Rascals	8 Christmas	13 Christmas
8:00	2 MASH	3 Hockey	4 Features
11:20	5 M*A*S*H	8 M*A*S*H	13 M*A*S*H
9:00	2 HBO-Who Are You?	3 The Debts	4 A Lady Named Bayle
11:20	5 Let's Make a Deal	8 Features	13 National Rodeo
9:30	2 HBO-Stepping Out	3 The Debts	4 Grow Up
11:20	5 Connections	8 Vegas	13 Vegas
10:00	2 HBO-Force of One	3 Rookies	4 Rookies
11:20	5 Rookies	8 Rookies	13 Rookies
9:00	2 PTL Network	3 PTL Network	4 PTL Network
11:20	5 PTL Network	8 PTL Network	13 PTL Network
9:30	2 HBO-Who Are You?	3 The Debts	4 A Lady Named Bayle
11:20	5 Let's Make a Deal	8 Features	13 National Rodeo
9:30	2 HBO-Stepping Out	3 The Debts	4 Grow Up
11:20	5 Connections	8 Vegas	13 Vegas
10:00	2 HBO-Force of One	3 Rookies	4 Rookies
11:20	5 Rookies	8 Rookies	13 Rookies
9:00	2 PTL Network	3 PTL Network	4 PTL Network
11:20	5 PTL Network	8 PTL Network	13 PTL Network

The Chart is not responsible for the accuracy of these television listings. They are furnished to The Chart by Cablecom of Joplin and are published by The Chart as a public service to the students, faculty, and staff of Missouri Southern State College.

tuesday

6:00	2 MacNeil/Lehrer Report	3 News	4 Star Trek
11:20	5 News	8 News	13 News
6:30	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 HBO-Diamonds are Forever	3 Sound Stage	4 Barbara Walters
11:20	5 Barbara Walters	8 700 Club	13 Banquet
7:30	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son
11:20	5 Sanford & Son	8 Sanford & Son	13 Sanford & Son
7:00	2 NOVA	3 Joker's Wild	4 Happy Days
11:20	5 Happy Days	8 Rockford	13 Hocus Focus
8:00	2 HBO-Christmas on Ice	3 Okla. Report	4 Sanford & Son



Linda Castillon (left) wards off a pick. Pat McKay (for right) puts up a jump shot from the corner. Lisa Mitchell (above) and McKay (above, background) anticipate the rebound in basketball action Tuesday at PSU.

Lions lose to PSU, 67-61

The Lady Lions dropped their season record to 4-3 and their CSIC record starts at 0-1 as they lost to the Lady Gorillas of Pittsburgh State University 67-61 Tuesday night.

The Lions started the first half shooting an outstanding 63 percent from the field and 50 percent from the line and took a 35-27 lead to the lockerroom.

But Southern couldn't maintain its lead as the Lions shot a miserable 19 percent from the field and 33 percent from the line in the second half. PSU upped its scoring percentages from a first half low of 35 percent from the field and 50 percent from the line to a second half high of 61 percent from the field and 82 percent from the line.

Linda Castillon led the Lady Lions with 18 points, followed by Brenda Pitts with 12 points. Pam Brisby was the only other Lion in double figures with 10 points.

"We have to keep playing the whole game consistently," said Lady Lion head coach G.L. Willoughby. "We have a big game coming up with SMS this Friday. It's a very important district game for us."

THIS IS the Lady Lions' second loss in a row as they dropped the last game of the Ryland Milner Tournament to Northwest Missouri State by a score of 95-82. The Lady Lions finished second in the tournament, and Patti Killian and Brisby were selected to the All-Tournament team.

Brisby and Castillon were high scorers for Southern with 17 points each, and Lisa Mitchell added 11.

Southern played Northwest Missouri almost even in the second half but could not overcome their 54-24 first half deficit.

Continued on page 16



Forward Ricky Caver powers his way up to the basket through the PSU Gorillas' defense. Senior Randy Goughnour (below) intensely drives down the court for another Southern goal.

Lions post 4 straight with win over Harris

Missouri Southern's basketball Lions posted their fourth straight victory Saturday night, crushing Harris-Stowe College 88-70 in Young Gymnasium. Coach Chuck Williams' squad raised its seasonal record to 6-2 and evened its district mark at 2-2 with the win.

Five Lions hit the double figure column and everyone else on the team scored. Senior center Jerry Wilson was perfect for the night—7 of 7 from the field and 8 of 2 free throws for 18 points. Freshman guard Carl Tyler added 13 points and forwards Percy Brown, Ricky Caver, and Rod Shrum scored 10 each.

"This was the first time we had ever played Harris-Stowe," said Williams. "We didn't know much about them. We were able to dominate play from the beginning and built up a big lead as a result."

Southern blistered the nets with a 73 percentage effort from the field in the first half, rolling in a 38-20 margin in intermission. The Lions finished at 88 percent, sinking 33 of 61 shots.

HARRIS-STOWE, which fell to 4-6, pulled within 20 points once in the second half. The Hornets from St. Louis were led by 6-3 forward Jerry Ousley's 20 points.

"The coaching staff and team were happy with the student turnout," said Williams. "The R.B.'s seemed a lot of excitement."

Southern opened its Central States Intercollegiate Conference schedule last week with an 83-69 verdict over Pittsburg State in Young Gymnasium.

CAVER AND JUNIOR forward Skip Taylor each connected on 10 of 18 shots from the field to lead the Lions. Caver also sank seven charities to finish with 27 points. Senior guard Kenny Hineship chipped in with 10 points.

Pittsburg halved the Lions in even terms for most of the first half. Southern scored six straight points near the end of the half to take a 41-34 advantage into the locker room at intermission.

"We were a little flat the first half," said Williams. "That could probably be attributed to our emotional and physical fatigue from winning the Lionbacker tournament three days before. We took control early in the second half and open-

ed a 23-point bulge."

SOUTHERN CAPTURED first place in the 4th Annual Lionbacker Holiday Classic Tournament with a 82-67 decision over Arkansas Tech. The Lions gained the championship finals by defeating Southwestern Kansas College 85-59 the night before.

Brown, a 6-4 junior transfer, led the Green and Gold with a 20-point effort against Southwestern. Caver contributed 18 points in that game and 20 in the finale.

Said Williams, "Against Arkansas Tech we played one of our best games of the season. We were strong in all areas. We also played real well against Evangel three weeks ago."

SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS (69-62) and Rockhurst (60-55) have pinned the only two losses on the Lions this season.

"Our opening game against School of the Ozarks was a disappointment," said Williams. "We learned a lesson and would like to play it over again. We did not play well at Rockhurst, but it's no disgrace to lose to them. We feel, however, that we can beat them when they play us here Jan. 7."

Caver currently leads the club in scoring with 100 points, an average of 15.8. The 6-3 junior transfer has scored most of his points coming off the bench. Brown has tallied 76 points, Wilson 73, and Taylor 72.

SAID WILLIAMS, "Caver had back problems early in the year. We use him in a reserve role so he can get all his playing time in one stretch. He has adjusted real well and is doing a super job."

Wilson has pulled down 61 rebounds, or 7.6 per game. Caver and Brown are close behind with 47 and 41 caroms respectively. The Lions are averaging 37.9 boards as a team.

Southern closes this semester, hosting Southwest Baptist College Saturday night in a 7:20 District 18 contest. The Bearcats are currently 2-2 overall, dropping their last two starts in nationally ranked Cameron State and Drury (74-61) a week ago. Southwest Baptist returns four starters from last year's club which finished second behind Rockhurst in the district. The Lions will be idle until the Green and Gold Classic on Jan. 2-3.



Wanted: 15 soccer players for next season

Now that the season has concluded for the Southern soccer squad with the Annual Lionbacker Football-Soccer Banquet, Coach Hal Bodon has the job of trying to replace the people who have been lost due to graduation.

"Right now we are looking for 15 players, and I don't see any problem getting the number of players that we need, but I am worried that we might not get the quality of players that we need," said Bodon. "We have been winning 80 percent of our games the last two seasons, and that is a tough record to uphold."

BODON'S PROBLEMS will mainly be rebuilding his defense which has been a

dominating force the last two years. Graduating are goalkeeper George Major, centerbacks Rob Lonigro and Tim Behnen, and wingback Joe Angeles.

"Major, Lonigro, and Behnen were all first team selections in the District and with Angeles the four of them have been together for three years. They were just a well organized unit in front of the goal."

The other worry that will be laid due to graduation is the smallest on the soccer squad and a second team selection in the District this year, Todd Johnston.

"TODD HAS BEEN an outstanding worker over his four years at Southern

and the high point of his career was when he scored a goal against UMSL in St. Louis. I never saw him jump so high."

Bodon is planning an 8-10 game schedule for the amateur team, the Joplin Stars, which is composed of many of the players on the Southern roster.

"The spring season is basically for our players to improve their individual skills. The practices aren't as hard and it enables us to try things and see how they work."

DURING THE SPRING season the officials for the matches are also able to sharpen their skills.

"This year we are going to change to the three-man system for officiating. This will consist of one referee on the playing field and a lineman on each touchline," Bodon said.

Over the Thanksgiving holidays, Bodon attended the NAIA Soccer Tournament at Saginaw State, Springfield, Ill., and he received some new information concerning the national tournament.

"I AM ALMOST SURE that next year there will be 18 teams instead of 10 in the national tournament. In order to get one of the extra two teams they are going to take from Area 2 of which Southern is a member."

Major wins west team position

After being honored at the Annual Lionbacker Football-Soccer Banquet with the outstanding soccer career award, George Major was selected for the West squad in the 1980 Annual Intercollegiate Soccer Association of America East-West Soccer Match to be played at 7:30 p.m. Saturday at Lockhart Stadium in Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Southern's All-American goalkeeper will be sharing the goalkeeping chores with Randy Phillips of Southern Methodist University. Besides receiving All-American honors in 1979 when his .63 goal-against average enabled Southern's defense to be ranked among the nation's finest, Major was credited with 32 shutouts, made the All-District team three of his four years, and accumulated a record of 52-21-6.

During Major's stay in Florida this week, the squad was scheduled for two practice sessions a day along with activities which included attendance at the Miami Dolphin football game Monday night and a deep sea fishing trip.

Ozzie Harrell wins two awards at banquet

Senior defensive back Ozzie Harrell was the recipient of two awards last week at the Ninth Annual Lionbacker Honors Banquet.

Harrell received the Harry Spradling Award, which goes to the outstanding senior who displays leadership, enthusiasm, and sportsmanship. He was also named the Most Valuable Player in

football and was awarded the Dean Havens Memorial Trophy.

The Lionbackers Award of Excellence went to senior defensive end Roger Hoene. Harrell and Hoene were co-captains of the Lion squad, which finished with a 6-3-1 mark. Freshman Alan Dunaway captured Rookie of the Year

honors.

George Major, senior goalie for coach Hal Bodon's soccer Lions, was named the career player in his sport. He received a trophy, presented by his father, George, Sr.

Coaches Jim Frazier and Bodon recognized the seniors on their squads. Football Lions honored Harrell.

Hoene, Kenny Brown, Carl Cromer, Rob Goodwin, John McAllister, Dave Nevill, Darrell Scott, Pete Sullivan, and Bill Worthington.

Bodon recognized five seniors: Major, Joe Angeles, Tim Behnen, Todd Johnston, and Rob Lonigro. The soccer Lions finished the year at 15-4-1, losing to Harris-Stowe in district playoffs.

John Lennon: in Memoriam

By Joe Angeles

John Lennon, born Oct. 9, 1940, in Liverpool, died on arrival of gunshot wounds at Roosevelt General Hospital in New York City, Dec. 8, 1980.

An assassin had stalked him in the manner that fans stalked him for an autograph, a handshake, or just a glimpse.

Lennon teamed with Paul McCartney and they became one of the greatest songwriting teams the world has ever known. As a member of the Beatles they released 21 albums in the United States. After his marriage to Yoko Ono and his departure from the Beatles he released 11 more albums in the States.

Being a part of the Beatles' success in the music industry, he was a part of their conquering force that took the movie industry by storm and broke from film tradition.

A *Hard Day's Night* did not attempt to portray the Beatles as singing actors in the stereotyped dramatic situations of an Elvis Presley or Cliff Richards, but used dramatic techniques linked by surrealistic episodes to illustrate the lifestyle the band was actually living.

IN 1964 Lennon's first book was published and entitled *In His Own Write*, and he was invited to be guest of honor at Foyle's literary lunch.

But Lennon can never die as his life has been an influence in many areas.

"His influence has been very profound in the musical profession as well as in society in general," said William C. Elliot, assistant professor of music at Southern. "He hasn't influenced me personally, but I have enjoyed his music and he was a very gifted and talented person. I'm not really sure if the full impact of his music has even come about."

"LENNON WAS a fine artist in his own right, and his death was a great loss to music," said Dr. F. Joe Sims, head of the department of fine arts.

But Lennon was not satisfied with just being a successful musician.

"He was a very symbolic figure of change in the sixties," said Dr. Steven Grove, instructor in sociology. "I could never understand the attraction that the Beatles had and the longevity of the group."

"The White Album had to be their greatest work. It brought forth great social commentary and parody of

lifestyles," concluded Grove.

BUT LENNON did foresee his own violent death. In the song "I Am the Walrus," the ancient symbol of death, on the album *Magical Mystery Tour*, Lennon's voice can be heard amid orchestral background at the end speaking the following phrases:

*The pain. God. Mary.
The villain take my place. Is he dead?
There is death in my body.
Seize your mind upon it.
My God, an untimely death. Under an early death.
An unserviceable death and a serviceable villain.
"Is he dead?"
"Sit you down, Father."
"Bless you."
There are other phrases which can't be understood.*

Perhaps due to the nature of Lennon's death he will once again fuel the fire for change to eliminate, in the words of a *Kansas City Times* editorial, "an evil madness that destroys a peaceful, witty, caring, and creative man who is living his life, without harm, as he thinks he should."

Food committee to meet

On the agenda for a Food Service meeting at 3:30 p.m. in BSC-314 will be the discussion of action that been taken on complaints lodged during a Nov. 20 meeting.

Complaints then included the serving of cereal will past expiration dates, the amount of food received, the quality of the food, and the monotony of the menu.

Handy Andy Food Service director Ray Steele, Associate Dean of Students Doug Carnahan, and Dean of Students Glenn Dolence will attend tomorrow's meeting to discuss what has taken place to date.

Dolence also mentioned that the ad-

ministration has asked the Handy Andy Food Service for a bid on an "unlimited seconds" food plan for next year. The reason for this action is to see if the program would be financially feasible for the upcoming school year.

Dolence also said that if this proposal proved too costly for the prospective resident student that the administration would increase the allotment of the main entree on the menu from the current six ounces to maybe eight ounces.

During the last meeting the location had to be moved to the BSC Rotunda due to the large turnout of students concerned with the quality of food.

Funds sought for Vores

In a war accident on Thanksgiving Day, Southern graduate Cheryl Wissbaum Vore and her husband and graduate-to-be Jerry Vore lost their 19-day-old daughter Nicole Marie, and they themselves were severely injured.

Mrs. Vore suffered a broken jaw, and her husband five broken ribs. Both had multiple lacerations and bruises.

The accident happened about 100 miles from Mrs. Vore's parents' home near Conway, Mo. A car driving the opposite direction splashed slush onto the windshield of the Vore's car. While waiting for the wipers to clear the windshield, Vore hit a slick spot on the road. The car slid to the other side of the road and hit head-on

with another car. The child was killed on impact.

Southern's Industrial Technology Club, along with private donations from residents in the Joplin and Webb City area, has raised over \$1,500 to help with hospital expenses for the Vores.

Through a rummage sale, bake sale, and turkey drawing held last Friday and Saturday, the club raised \$1,000 of the amount.

Hospital expenses remain unpaid, however, for the Vores were without medical insurance. For anyone wishing to make further donations there is a special fund set up through Joplin Van World, P.O. Box 1784, Joplin.

Court ruling should have no affect

A recent decision by the 8th U.S. Circuit Court stated that University of Missouri-Kansas officials violated the Cornerstone's Campus Organization's (a Christian fundamental group) freedom of speech when they barred them from using campus facilities.

John Williams, the founder of the Cornerstone organization, recalls the two and a half years that the University did not allow them to use University facilities.

"WE WERE HURTING," says Williams. "We couldn't spread our messages to students. It was terribly frustrating. All we wanted to do was spread the teachings of Jesus Christ."

On the Missouri Southern campus this ruling should have little effect on policy, according to Dean of Students Glenn Dolence.

"Currently we allow campus organizations to use the Billingsly Student Center for their meetings. There is no charge to them for the use, just like any other student organization that wants to use the BSC for a meeting," said Dolence. "But we do not allow religious organizations to perform religious services on campus."

IN REGARDS to allowing the religious groups to be provided office space on the campus, Dolence said: "We do not offer space to any of the campus-recognized organizations. The only student groups that have office space in the BSC are the College Union Board and the Student Senate and that is because they are a student governing force."

On matters of using other campus facilities, such as Taylor Auditorium, by religious organizations, Dr. Paul Shipman, vice president for business affairs, said: "There is a fee charged to all groups for the use of Taylor Auditorium. If the group that is wishing to use the auditorium is recognized on campus, then they receive a discounted rate. But Taylor Auditorium has the same policy as other buildings on campus, that no religious services may be performed in them. If these organizations just need the space for a meeting, that is all right."

THE RULING was handed down by the 8th District Circuit Court stating that "allowing religious groups to hold meetings on school grounds would not more commit the University to religious goals than they are now committed to the goals of groups like the Young Democrats and the Young Socialists Alliance, which also use school facilities."

This verdict overturned a lower court decision last spring that ruled Cornerstone could not have its on-campus forum. The ruling stated "the infringement, if any, of the group's free exercise of rights was justified by a compelling state interest—Missouri's long history of separation of church and state."

But this issue has not been laid to rest, as the University of Missouri has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to review the case.

Finals time drug time for some students

By Joe Angeles

In an attempt to combat drowsiness and the lack of sleep during the final week of the semester, some students turn to drugs, mainly amphetamines to stay awake.

Amphetamines were first produced in the 1890s for medical use and are stimulants to the central nervous system. They are best known for their ability to combat fatigue and sleepiness. They are also used to curb appetite in medically supervised weight reduction programs. The most commonly used stimulants are amphetamines, dextroamphetamines, and metamphetamines.

BUT ACCORDING to Dr. Donald R. Patterson, M.D., the medical use of amphetamines has been on the decrease in recent years.

"I haven't prescribed the drug for years for the basic reason of weight reduction. The only time that I do prescribe the drug

is in the treatment of narcolepsy, a disease that makes the patient very sleepy. The other reason is for patients with minimal brain disorders."

"The main reason that I don't use the drugs anymore is that they were not that effective. State organizations have also asked that doctors limit their use of amphetamines. Many of the companies have stopped their production of amphetamines entirely."

WHEN AMPHETAMINES get into the body, they stimulate the release of norepinephrine, a substance stored in the nerve endings, and concentrate it in the higher centers of the brain. This speeds up the action of the heart and the metabolism, the body's process for converting food into the chemicals it needs.

The amphetamines increase the heart rate, raise blood pressure, cause palpitations, dilate the pupils, and cause dry mouth, sweating, headache, diarrhea, and paleness.

"Those amphetamines are a dangerous drug. The user may build up a physical dependence," said Dr. Patterson. "Then the user needs one to get up in the morning and then later at night when he can't get sleepy, he may look for downers to make him drowsy. Then it turns into a vicious cycle. The user enjoys the high too much."

DR. PATTERSON continued: "The thing that is very dangerous is when the user comes down from his high after an extended period of use. The user will experience great depression and drowsiness when he crashes. Also, when the user is on speed, he takes in very little food and this also adds to the depression and drowsiness."

Habitual users of speed are also susceptible to contact colds, viruses, infections, or anything else requiring normal body defenses, which the amphetamines partially or entirely wear down.

Amphetamines are produced in dif-

ferent types such as benzedrine, ferndex, diphylete, and methedrine.

"THE DRUGS come in tablet or time-release capsule. The tablets are usually 5-10 mg doses and the time-release capsules are 15 mg doses," said Dr. Patterson.

Stimulants are regulated by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice. They require a strict accounting of supplies of drugs by the manufacturer, the distributor, and the seller, and restrict the user to five refills of the prescription, at the discretion of his physician.

Illicit manufacturing and dispensing of the drug can bring fines up to \$10,000 and prison sentences up to 5 years. Those convicted of selling the drugs to persons under 21 years of age can be fined \$15,000 or \$20,000 and receive 10 to 15 years in jail. Mere possession of the drug illegally can bring a fine of from \$1,000 to \$10,000 and/or imprisonment of 1 to 3 years.

Those who sleep less than 6 hours normal

By Ramona Carlin

Although there isn't much information on whether people who sleep six hours or less are any different in other ways than those of us who sleep the normal eight hours, Dr. Allan Combs and a staff of four from his experimental psychology course introduced and held a survey to find the answers and results of the effects of sleeping only five to six hours a night and what kind of effects it had on college students at Southern.

Many questions plagued the four-student team consisting of Gene Simmons, Debbie Gonterman, Lynn Dose, and Mike Herron. Such questions as could anxiety be causing the short term sleep? or Are these people who only sleep five hours or less more intelligent, highly

active, or busier?, or Do such things as coffee, tea, soft drinks, all containing caffeine or even the use of drugs such as speed affect the way they sleep?, all need answers.

THE STUDENT surveyors went into various classrooms and talked to a lot of students as well as putting up signs to find students on campus who only slept five to six hours every night.

After the 29 volunteers had signed up they were given a short form aptitude test. This test gave an approximate estimation of each person's I.Q. The average I.Q. of the 15 men and 14 women was found to be around 110. "This is about normal for undergraduate college students", said Combs. Also the average

age of the group was about 21 years.

"This age group was a little high but most of the students used were from night classes," commented Combs.

"The general results were not surprising," said Combs. People who sleep less than six hours a night were found to be just like the average person with no extra anxiety. Most of the participants' answers to the questions of drinking substances with caffeine or taking drugs varied anywhere from not taking any at all to one man who drank up to 16 cups of coffee a day. Some of the participants also admitted to taking drug substances such as speed, (amphetamines). The evidence showed that the people were rated along the average population.

ANOTHER FACT discovered was that the people who sleep less than six hours a night (which is about 10 percent of the population) were right on the mark on the anxiety scale, although it was found that women are more anxious than men.

Also, when asked, the students felt that they were getting about the right amount of sleep for them. Although a few said that they would like to have maybe one more hour of sleep, and some wanted eight to 10, most generally said they were happy with the amount they were getting. It was also noted that nine people worked on night shifts.

"So," summed up Combs, "contrary to what people believe, the students who get between five and six hours of sleep a night are normal."

Lady Lions

from page 15

Once again Southern had a tough time scoring from the field as they shot an unimpressive 37 percent.

IN THE SECOND round of tournament action Southern won a district game from Evangel 82-60. Brieby again

was high scorer with 28 points. Castillon and Pitts were in double figures with 18 and 14 points respectively.

"We played good defense and our offense clicked," said Willoughby. "It was a good team effort; the poise was there."

In the opening round of the tournament Southern won easily 85-54.

SOUTHERN'S LEADING SCORER was Killian with 16 and Mary Carter was the only other player in double figures with 10.

The Lady Lions' next game is Friday in Young Gymnasium at 7 p.m. against Southwest Missouri State. Southern is

currently 1-1 against SMS.

Linda and Kim Castillon will be playing against Kim's twin sister Cindy who is a junior at SMS. She played her first two years at Crowder College. Both years she attended Crowder, she participated in the national junior college tournament.

SEA to fete

SEA (Student Education Association) will be sponsoring a Christmas party for the Ecumenical Day Care Center at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow. Games will be played, and there will be refreshments for the children. All persons interested in participating should meet at the ECM Building no earlier than 12:30.

From the staff of The Chart

Merry Christmas, Happy New Year!

May your holidays be bright!